CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

the vishṇukuṇḍis and their times

(an epigraphical study)

4689

S. SANKARANARAYANAN

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

THE VISHṆUKUṆDIS
AND
THEIR TIMES

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Ph. D., Thesis approved by Karnataka University.

4689

State Museum Library Lucknow

FIRST PUBLISHED 1977

© *Dr. S. Sankaranarayanan*

PUBLISHED BY : *Agam Prakashan*, 1736, Trinagar, Delhi-110035,

DISTRIBUTED BY : *D.K. Publishers' Distributors*, 1, Ansari Road, New Delhi-110002, Phone : 274819.

PRINTED AT : Vishal Printers, 2/34, Roop Nagar, Delhi.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

ॐ

समर्पणम्

श्रीपर्वतमहास्वामिमल्लिकार्ज्जुनपादयोः ।
श्रीविष्णुकुण्डिराजभ्यः पुरा संप्रत्तराज्ययोः ।।
श्रीमच्छङ्करपूर्वेण नारायणसुधीमता ।
अलमेलु - श्रीनिवासतनूजेनेशतुष्टये ।।
ग्रन्थपुष्पांजलिरियं नत्या भक्त्या समर्प्यते ।।

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

FOREWORD

Decades ago our knowledge of the history of the Daccan from the fall of the Sātavāhanas in the third century A.D. to the rise of the Chālukyas in the sixth century A.D. was practically nil. But it is not so now. The history of this region during this period of nearly three hundred years has now been in a measure reconstructed, thanks to the discovery of a few new inscriptions, both stone and copper-plate, and attempts made by scholars in studying them. Among the more important dynasties that flourished in the Deccan during the period was that of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. Much has been written on the genealogy and chronology of the dynasty by scholars like kielhorn, Hultzsch, Duberuil, Krishna Sastri, K. V. Lakshmana Rao, D. C. Sircar, K. A. Nilakantha Sastri, R. S. Panchamukhi, N. Venkataramanayya, R. Rama Rao and others but one finds much divergence of opinion among them. The recent discovery of two sets of copper plates of this dynasty from Indrapalanagara has necessitated some revision in the history of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. The present work *The Vishṇukuṇḍis And Their Times*, by Dr. S. Sankaranarayanan which earned for him the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the Karnatak University, Dharwar is the first exhaustive work, exclusively devoted to the study of the history of the Vishṇukuṇḍi dynasty and is a welcome addition to the slender historical literature on the early history of the Deccan.

Many aspects of the history of the dynasty such as its name, the genealogy and chronology of the dynasty, the general background of its history taking into account the origin, original home and social status of the rulers of the family, its rise to power, the history of its early rulers, an account of its political history from the reign of Gōvindavarman I to the end of the reign of Mādhavavarman IV who fell a prey to his own ambitions by invading the Kaliṅga territory which ultimately resulted in the disappearance of the family, the description of the feudatories of the Vishṇukuṇḍis and the advent of the power of that of the Chālukyas of Vātāpi in the region are dealt with in detail in the present work. The book also contains chapters on the administration, society, religion, education, art and architecture under the Vishnukundis, thus fully justifying the title of the book. The second part of the book containing the texts of the inscriptions of the dynasty as also a few others, and the Appendices at the end are good and useful.

Dr. Sankaranarayanan's good grounding in Sanskrit, experience as a seasoned epigraphist, unbiased approach and the unoffending style of presenting his thoughts and views on complicated questions relating to the study of the history of the dynasty can be seen through out the book. His scheme of chronology and genealogy seems to be on the whole reasonable in the light of available evidence. Some of his views such as those on the name of the dynasty, its orign its, original home in the region round about the Śrīśailam hills, its relations with the Vākāṭakas in the north and the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Pallavas in the south and the advent of the Chālukya power that succeeded that of the Vishṇukuṇḍis in the region are interesting and thought provoking. The two chapters on the cultural aspects of the Vishnukundi history during the period are valuable.

The book which embodies much painstaking research on the subject is highly informative and a good contribution to knowledge on one of the important dynasties in the Daccan about which much was not known. Dr. Sankaranarayanan has succeeded in presenting a good account of the history of the Vishṇukuṇḍis and their times and I hope his book will be received well by ancient Indian historians, particularly of the Deccan.

Ramakrishna Nagar,
Madras–28.
24-9-1976.

T. V. MAHALINGAM, M. A., D. LITT.,
Professor of Ancient History
& Archaeology (Retd.),
University of Madras,
MADRAS-5

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

INTRODUCTION

The family of the Vishṇukuṇḍis came to be known to the historian for the first time in 1896 when the text of the Chikkulla plates of Vikramēndravarman II of the dynasty was published. Since then the history of this royal house has been engaging the attention of the eminent scholars like, Prof. Kielhorn, Sri H. Krishna Sastri, G. Jouveau Dubreuil, Dr. Hultzsch, Sri K. V. Laksman Rao, Dr. D. C. Sircar, Sri R. S Panchamukhi, Sri B. V. Krishna Rao, Dr. K. Gopalachari, Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri and others. Of these scholars some have dealt with the history of the family briefly and others a little elaborately. There have also been long controversies and uncompromisingly opposite views among these writers on different problems connected with the history of this family and they were very much attracting my attention for a long time. The result is the present work. I feel very much indebted to all the earlier writers who had dealt with the one or other problem connected with the history of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. In the present work an attempt has been made to study the history of the Vishṇukuṇḍis as completely as possible. During the course of the present study many new conclusions have been arrived at, a few of which are worth recounting.

The name of the dynasty is Vishṇukuṇḍi (and not Vishṇukuṇḍin) called after its founder; there had been at least eight kings in the family ruling from c. 375 A. D. down to c. 612 A. D. and among them there were two Mādhavavarmans, *i. e.*, the second and the fourth of that name, claiming eleven *Aśvamēdhas* each, etc. the latter being great-grandson of the former.

The Vishṇukuṇḍis hailed from the Śrīparvata *i.e.*, the modren Śrīśailam in Andhrapradesh) area and they were perhaphs ethnically connected with the Chuṭus of the earlier period and they claimed to be *Brahmakshatras*—a term of techinical import as the *Purāṇas* indicate. The early members of the family started ruling over the region of the Nalgonda and Mahbubnagar districts (*i. e.*, the ancient Ṛishika country) perhaps as feudatories under the Vākāṭakas and the kings of subsequent times became independent and expanded their kingdom towards the east. The power of the dynasty reached its zenith during the time of Mādhavavarman II, who married a princes of the main house of the Vākāṭakas; performed many great royal sacrifices to mark his military achievements in many directions; had his capital at Trivaranagara *i. e* , the modern Tiruvūru. The significance of his sacrifices and of his titles of technical import are studied here in the light of the ancient Indian literature, classical, legal, ritualistic and so on. The Vicissitudes of the family during the period of Mādhavavarman's successors and their contacts, both friendly and inimical, with their contemporary powers like, the Vākāṭakas, the Maukharis, the Châlukyas, the Pallavas etc., are traced logically and in a sequeuce in the light of the epigraphs.

The present study also reveals that this dynasty was served at least by three feudal families and it came to an end, all on a sudden, in c. 612 A. D. plunging the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

country into confusion and chaos; that the neighbouring powers *viz.*, the Chālukyas and the Pallavas, tried to grab their territory; and that in their mutual wars that ensued, the former emerged victorious ultimately. In the last two chapters attempts have been made to study the conditions of the government machinery, society, education, religions, art, architecture etc., with the available material. Here too, as in the case of the study of the political history of the family, new facts come to the fore.

The Second part contains the texts of eighteen inscriptions, with critical notes. Of them, ten are of the Vishṇukuṇḍis, five of their feudatories, two of the Chālukyas and one of the Pallavas. They have been chosen with a view to focus them in one place, and they form the backbone of the present work. Though all these records are known earlier, their readings and interpretations improved largely. I regret that the mere consideration of space has compelled me to drop the translations and illustrations of these epigraphs—which are no doubt essential. Similarly almost all these epigraphs have been already illustrated in one or the other research publications. The relevant passages of other epigraphs, from the places like Haraha, Jaunpur, Aihole, Kopparam etc., that are also absolutely necessary for a fuller understanding of the history of the Vishuṇukuṇḍi period are dealt with adequately in the First Part itself. But their contents however, have been discussed elaborately in the First part.

The present book is appended with eight appendices, each dealing with one or more expressions or passages, or regal titles that are met with in the records of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. Of these, I, III and VI have been since published with slight modifications by me respectively in the *Purāṇa*, XIV, No. 1, pp. 11ff; *JOI*, XXIII, pp. 209 ff; *AIH*, V, 256 ff.

Inspite of all these, I am not unaware of the shortcomings of the present book. For, it is a fact that there is paucity of the first-hand source-material necessary for a complete study of the history of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. Consequently, it becomes inevitable that at times one has to fill up the gaps, both wide and narrow, in the narration by taking recourse to the secondary and circumstancial evidences available. The chief and the only helper and guide in handling these evidences is logic and logic alone. But every logic-however good and strong it may be—is after all like a wrestler, and is liable to be supperceded and beaten down by a better and stronger one (*Tarkāpratishṭhānāt*). Again it is a universal law that nothing in the world can claim to be absolutely perfect and to gratify one and all (*n=āsty=ēva taj=jagati sarva—manōramaṅ yat*). Hence the present work, in no way exception to that law may, because of the new suggestions it contains, invite both hyper criticisms as well as highly encouraging appreciations individually from among the scholarly world. One is reminded of the following verse of Mahimabhaṭṭa :

Anyair=an—ullikhita —pūrvam=idam bruvāṇō
nūnam smṛitēr=vishayatāṁ vidushām=upēyām
hās—aika—kāraṇa—gavēshaṇayā nav—ārtha—
tattv—āvamarśa—paritōsha-samīhayā vā

Hence in all humility I dedicate this book to the world of scholars with the following request of mine :—

Prajñāparādhād=iha yad=duruktaṁ
n=ōktaṁ=cha yat=tad=vibudhaḥ sva—matyā
samyag=vimṛiśy=aiva guṇ—aika—dṛishṭyā
marshantu śaṁsantu cha mat—prabandham

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Dr. P. B. Desai, Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture and Director of the Kannada Reaserch Institute, Karnatak University, Dharwar, was kind enough to be my guide during 1967-70 while I was working on the thesis *The Vishnukundis And Their Inscriptions* for the Ph. D. degree. I must say that he was more than a guide to me. The present book is substantially based on that thesis and has been thoroughly revised. During the said period I was also immensely helped and benefitted by my discussions on the subject with Dr. Shrinivas Ritti, Dr. B. R. Gopal (the then Readers of Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Karnatak University); Shri H. K. Narasimhaswami, Shri P. R. Srinivasan, Shri K. G. Krishnan (the then Suptng. Epigraphists, Office of the Chief Epigraphist, Mysore).

In order to get some elucidation on certain points, I wrote at times to Dr. D. C. Sircar (the then Chemical Professor of Ancient Indian History, University of Calcutta); Dr. V. V. Mirashi (Hony. Professor, University of Nagpur); Shri K. R. Srinivasan and Shri K. V. Soundara Rajan (the then Suptng. Archaeologists, Archaeological Survey of India). Their immediate and unreserved replies were helpful to me.

The authorities to the Karnatak University, Dharwar, kindly accorded permission to register myself as an external student of the University to work on the thesis for which they also awarded the Ph. D. Degree with permission to get the thesis published.

The Director General, Archaeological Survey of India, New Delhi has been extermely kind to me by permitting me to work for the Doctorate Degree and to get the present book published. The Chief Epigraphist, Mysore, supplied, on my request, photographs of some inscriptions for my study.

Dr. T. V. Mahalingam, Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient History & Archaeology (Retd.), University of Madras, was gracious enough to adorn the book by writing a scholarly Foreword. Dr. M. D. Sampath, Dy. Suptng. Epigraphist, Mysore, helped me by arranging the Publishers for this book, by going through the proof pages and by assisting me in preparing Index.

I am immensely grateful and wholeheartedly thankful to all these reputed scholars.

I sincerely thank the Agam Prakashan and D. K. Publishers' Distributors, New Delhi, for publishing this work in excellent form and the Press for brining out the book quickly. Shri I. C. Mittel and Shri Agam Prasad have been evincing a personal interest in the proper and speedy production of this book. It is difficult indeed to thank them adequately for this.

Mysore
1-11-1976.

S. SANKARANARAYANAN.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

ABBREVIATIONS

ABORI.	*Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute, Poona.*
Addh.	*Addhyāya.*
Adhi.	*Adhikaraṇa.*
AED.	*Ancient History of the Deccan* by Jouvean-Dubreuil.
Agni.	*Agni Purāṇa.*
Ai. B.	*Aitarēya Brāhmaṇa.*
ATOC.	*Proceedings and Transactions of All India Oriental Conference.*
AIU.	*The Age of Imperial Unity*, Edited by R.C. Majumdar etc.
AK.	Ancient Karnataka by Salatore.
Amara.	*Amarakōśa.*
APGAS.	*Andhra Pradesh Government Archaeological Series.*
APGMS.	*Andhra Pradesh Government Museum Series.*
Āp. Ś.	*Āpastamba Śrautasūtra.*
ARE.	*Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy* or *South Indian Epigraphy.*
AR, AD.	*Annual Report, Archaeological Department.*
ARMM.	*Archaeological Remains, Monuments, Museums*, Archaeological Survey of India, 1964.
Artha.	*Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya.
ASI, AR.	*Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report.*
ASLP.	*Administration and Social Life Under the Pallavas* by C. Minākshi.
A Soc. S.I.	*The Archaeological Society of South India* (Madras) Transactions.
ASS.	Anandasrama Sanskrit Series.
Āś. Ś.	*Asvalayans Śrautasūtra*
ASSI.	*Archaeological Survey of Southern India.*
ASWI.	*Archaeological Survey of Western India.*
ASVOI.	*Annals of Śrī Vēṅkaṭēśvara Oriental Institute, Tirupati.*
BD.	*The Bōdhisattva Doctrin in the Buddhist Sanskrit Literature* by Har Dayal.
BG.	*Bombay, Gazetteer*, Vol. I, pt. ii. Other Volumes are specified in the respective places.
Bhâga.	*Bhāgavata Purāṇa.*
BMGM.	*Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum.*
Bō.Ś.	*Bōdhāyana Śrautasūtra.*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Br.	*Brāhmaṇa.*
BRA & HA.	*Buddhist Remains in Andhra and The History of Andhra* by K.R. Subramanian.
Brahma.	*Brahma Purāṇa.*
Bṛih.	*Bṛihatsaṁhitā* of Varāhamihira.
Br. S.	*Brahma Sutra* of Badarayana.
Bud. Hyb. Skt. Dict.	*Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* by Franclin Edgerten.
BV.	*Bharatiya Vidya.*
CA.	*The Classical Age*, Edited by R.C. Majumdar, etc.
CHI.	*Cambridge History of India*, Edited by Rapson.
CII.	*Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum.*
Comm.	*Commentary.*
Com. HI.	*A comprehensive History of India*, Edited by K.A.N. Sastri.
CTP.	*Cave-Temples of the Pallavas* by K.R. Srinivasan.
Daśa.	*Daśakumāracharita* of Daṇḍin.
Dharma.	*Dharmasaṅgraha* of Nāgārjuna.
EECS.	*Early Eastern Chālukyan Sculpture* by C. Sivaramamurti.
DHNI.	*Dynastic History of Northern India* by H.C. Ray.
DKA.	*The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of Kali Age*, Ed. Pargiter.
EA.	*Epigrāphia Andhrica.*
EC.	*Epigraphia Carnatica.*
ECV.	*The Eastern Chālukyas of Vēṅgī* by M. Venkataramanayya.
ED.	*A History of the Early Dynasties of Āndhradēśa* by B.V. Krishna Rao.
EHAC.	*Early History of the Andhra Country* by K. Gopalachari.
EHD.	*Early History of the Deccan*, edited by G. Yazdani.
EI.	*Epigraphia Indica.*
FNSI.	*Foreign Notices of South India* by K.A.N. Sastri.
GOS.	*Gaekward Oriental Series.*
Hari.	*Harivaṁśa Purāṇa*
Harsha.	*Harshacharita* of Bāṇa.
HIIA.	*History of Indian and Indonesian Art* by A.K. Coomaraswamy.
HISI.	Sewell's *The Historical Inscriptions of Southern India*, Ed. by S.K. Ayangar.
HK.	*History of Kanauj* by R.S. Tripathi.
HPK.	*History of the Pallavas of Kāñchi* by K. Gopalan
HSAD.	*Historical Sketches of Ancient Dekhan* by K.V. Subrahmanya Aiyar.
HSI.	*A History of South India* by K.A.N. Sastri, III Ed.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

IA.	*Indian Antiquary.*
IC.	*Indian Culture.*
IEG.	*Indian Epigraphical Glossary* by D.C. Sircar.
IHC.	*Indian History Congress.*
IHQ.	*Indian Historical Quarterly.*
Ind. Arch.	*Indian Archaeology, A Review.*
Inscr.	Inscription
IOC.	*Indian Oriental Conference, Proceedings and Transactions.*
JAHRS.	*Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society.*
JAIH.	*Journal of Ancient Indian History.*
JASB.	*Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal.*
Jātaka.	*Jātakamalā of Ārya-Śūra.*
JBBRAS.	*Journal of Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Soceity.*
JBORS.	*Journal of Bihar and Orissa Research Society.*
JC.	*Janāśrayī Chhamdōvichiti*
JDL.	*Journal of Department of Letters, Calcutta University.*
JIH.	*Journal of Indian History.*
JMU.	*Journal of the Madras University.*
JNSI.	*Journal of the Numismatic Society of India.*
JOI.	*Journal of Oriental Institute*, Baroda.
JOR.	*Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.*
JPASB.	*Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.*
JRAS.	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.*
JRASB(L)	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal; Letters.*
JSI.	*Janism in South India* by P.B. Desai.
Kāda.	*Kādambarī* of Bāṇa.
Kāma.	*Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana.
Kathā.	*Kathāsaritsāgara* of Sōmadēva.
Kāvya.	*Kāvyamīmāṁsā* of Rajaśēkhara.
KESIH.	*Kāñchīpuram in Early South Indian History*, by T.V. Mahalingam.
KHD.	Kene's *History of Dharmśāstra.*
KM & SA.	*The Kāvērī, The Maukharis & The Saṅgam Age* by T.G. Aravamuthan.
Kṛitya. Rāja.	*Kṛityakalpataru, Rājadharmakāṇḍa* of Lakshmīdhara.
Kṛitya. Vyavahāra.	*Kṛityakalpataru, Vyavahārakāṇḍa* of Lakshmīdhara.
LARPM.	*List of the Antiquarian Remains in the Presidency of Madras* by R. Sewell, Vol. I.
Lectures.	*Lectures on the Ancient History of India* by D.R. Bhandarkar.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

LL.	Lüders' *A List of Brahmī Inscriptions.*
LPA.	Longhurst's *Pallava Architecture.*
Mālavikā.	*Mālavikāgnimitra* of Kālidāsa.
Manu.	*Manusmṛiti.*
MAR.	*Mysore Archaeological Report.*
MASI.	*Memoirs of Archaeological Survey of India.*
Matsya.	*Matsyapurāṇa.*
Matta.	*Mattavilāsa-Prahasana of* Mahēndravikrama.
Mau.	*The Maukharis* by E. A. Pires.
MB.	*Mahābhārata*
MDG.	Madras District Gazetteer.
Mēgha.	*Mēghadūta* of Kālidāsa.
MG.	*Mysore Gazetteer.*
Nāma.	*Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* of Amarasiṁha.
NS.	New Series.
NSP.	*Nirnayasagar Press Edition.*
PA.	Pārṇini's *Ashṭādhyāyī.*
PED.	*Pali-English Dictionary,* PTS.
PHAI.	*Political History of Ancient India* by H. C. Raychaudhuri.
PSED.	Apte's *Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary.*
PTS.	*Pāli Text Society* (London) *Edition.*
QJMS.	*Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society.*
Raghu.	*Raghuvaṁśa* of Kālidāsa.
Rāma.	*Rāmāyaṇa of* Vālmiki.
RC.	Rapson's *Catalogue of the Indian Coins in the British Museum.*
Śa. B.	*Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa.*
Sa. Ś.	*Satyāshāḍha-Śrautaśūtra.*
SBE.	*Sacred Books of the East Series.*
SED.	Monier-William's *Sanskrit English Dictionary.*
SEHI.	Smith's *Early History of India,* IV Ed.
SII.	*South Indian Inscriptions.*
SG.	*Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India* by D.C. Sircar.
S. Ins.	*Select Inscriptions* by D. C. Sircar.
SRL.	*Studies in the Religious Life of Ancient And Medieval India* by D. C. Sircar.
SS.	*Successors of the Sātavahanas in the Lower Deccan* by D. C. Sircar.
SVP.	*Srī Venkatesvara Press Edition.*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Tā. B.	*Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa.*
Tai. B.	*Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa.*
Tai. S.	*Taittirīya-Saṁhitā.*
TL.	*Three Lectures* by K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyer.
TPCP.	*Thirty Pallava Copper-Plates*, Pub. Tamil Hist. Academy.
Uttara.	*Uttararāmacharita* P.V. Kane's Ed.
Vāmana.	*Vāmana Purāṇa*
Vāsava.	*Vasavadattā of Subandhu.*
Vāyu.	*Vāyu Purāṇa.*
VIJ.	*Viśvēśvarānand Indological Journal.*
Vīra. Rāja.	*Vīramitrōdaya, Rājanītiprakēśa* of Mitramiśra.
Vīra. Vyavahāra	*Viramitrōdaya, Vyavahāraprakēśa* of Mitramiśra.
Viṣhṇu.	*Vishṇudharmōttara Purāṇa.*

MODE OF TRANSLITERATION

The method adopted in this Book for transliterating the Sanskritic, Prakritic and Dravidian expressions is smilar to the one that has been accepted and followed in the volumes of the *Indian Antiquary* and *Epigraphia Indica*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CONTENTS

Foreword
Introduction
Acknowledgement &
Mode of Transliteration
Abbreviations

PART I : HISTORY

CHAPTER I ; PROLEGOMENA : Pages 1—17.

Vishṇukuṇḍi dynasty—its importance.

(i) Name of the dynasty : Vishṇukuṇḍi, not Vishṇukuṇḍin.

(ii) Genealogy and Chronology : Theory I, three Mādhavavarmans (out of four) claiming eleven Aśvamēdhas etc—Theory II, three Mādhavavarmans all with that claim—Theory III, only one Mādhavavarman (out of two) with that claim—Theory IV, two Mādhavavarmans (out of three) with that claim—their respective chronological schemes—popularity of theories III and IV—their weakness and strength—genealogy and dates—furnished by the Tummalagudem and Polamuru plates—solution to the problem—two Mādhavavarmans (out of four) with the said claim—Vikramahēndravarman identical with Vikramēndravarman I—age of the dynasty c. 375 A.D to 612 A.D.

References and Notes.

CHAPTER II : THE BACKGROUND : Pages 18—30.

(i) The origin and the original Home of the Vishṇukuṇḍis : Theories of Vinukoṇḍa origin and of North Indian origin—Original home Śrīparvata i.e. the Śrīsailam.

(ii) Meaning of 'Vishṇukuṇḍi' : Theory deriving the name from 'Vishṇukuṇḍa' fire-pit—the theories connecting it with the 'Vishṇukuṇḍi' river, with Vinukoṇḍa—'Vishṇukuṇḍi', a personal name—connection between the names Vishṇukuṇḍi and Viṇhukaḍa of the Chuṭu coins and inscriptions—Rapson's theory—the Chuṭu-Vishṇukuṇḍi connection—objections and answers.

(iii) Social Status of the Vishṇukuṇḍis : Agnikula-Kshatriya theory —Brāhmaṇa theory—Vishṇukuṇḍis' epithets *Andhrapati* and *Brah-*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

makshatra—Purāṇic explanation of the same—support from the *Pūrvamīmāṁsā*.

References and Notes.

CHAPTER III : THE RISE OF THE VISHṆUKUṆḌIS : Pages 31—44.

(i) Nucleus : Mahbubnagar—Nalgoṇḍa region, Ṛishika country —epigraphical literary evidences—objections and answers.

(ii) Early History of Ṛishika : Ṛishika under the Mauryas—under the Sātavāhanas—under the Śrīparvatīyas i.e. the Chuṭus—Ṛishika rulers and the Vākāṭakas—and the Kadambas.

(iii) Early Vishṇukuṇḍi Rulers : Rise of the chief Vishṇukuṇḍi—*Mahārāja* Indravarman I—*Mahārāja* Mādhavavarman I—influence —of the Vākāṭakas of Main lines—objections and answers.

(iv) Gōvindavarman I : His Tummalagudem charter—its unusual features—later adapted copy of original grant of villages to the Buddhist monks—rise of Gōvindavarman I—his annexation in the east—his vassal—chief queen—achievements—religion.

References and Notes.

CHAPTER IV : ZENITH OF THE VISHṆUKUṆḌI POWER : Pages 45—59.

(i) Inscriptions of Mādhavavarman II: (1) The Velpuru pillar inscription—(2) the Ipur plates, set I—(3) the Khanapur plates—identification of Mādhavavarmans of these charters—the Khanapur plates, probably of a Rāshṭrakūṭa of Mānapura.

(ii) Career of Mādhavavarman II : His independence—annexation overthrow of the Sālaṅkāyanas—war with the Pallavas—annexations—conquest beyond the Gōdāvarī—relationship with, and help to, the Vākāṭakas—South Kōsala—Western boundary of Mādhavavarman's kingdom—relation with the Rāshṭrakuṭas of Mānapura—and with the Kadambas—Mādhavavarman II, the lord of the Southern *Chakravarttikshetra*—performance of the *Aśvamēdhas* etc.

(iii) Family of Mādhavavarman II : Queens—sons—grandsons—capital—Trivaranagara i.e. Tiruvuru.

References and Notes.

CHAPTER V : SETBACK AND RECOVERY : Pages 60-79.

(i) Vikramēndravarman I : His epithets *Mahārāja* and *Mahākavi*—patronage to Hinduism and Buddhism—Harishēṇa's interference in Andhra politics—eclipse of the Vishṇukuṇḍi power—rebellion of the feudatories.

(ii) Mādhavavarman III : Son of Dēvavarman—Ipur plates set II—Mādhavavarman III, member of collateral branch—governor of the Kandarapura country—titles—aggression and occupation of the eastern Vēṅgī—his acceptance of Harishēṇa's overlordship—defeat

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

by Indrabhaṭṭarakavarman—theory of compromise—Vishṇukuṇḍi loss of Guntur area.

(iii) Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman : The Ramatirtham plates—acc. c. 526 A.D. army of elephants—war with the confederacy of rebellions chiefs, Pṛithivīmula, Gaṅga Indravarman I—results—war with Mādhavavarman III and the latter's defeat—rise of the Chālukyas and the decline of the Vākāṭakas—Indrabhaṭṭāraka's relation with them—Vishṇukuṇḍi coins from Pavner—Indrabhaṭṭarakavarman's interest in Vākāṭaka politics—war with the Nalas—invasion of Kaliṅga—war with the Maukhari Īśānavarman in the Vindhyan region—the Haraha and Jaunpur inscriptions—Vishṇukuṇḍi defeat—causes—peace and marriage treaty—sudden death of Indrabhaṭṭāraka—his other activities—*birudas*.
Reference and Notes.

CHAPTER VI : DECLINE AND FALL : Pages 80-93.

(i) Vikramēndravarman II: (1)The Chikkulla plates—(2) the Tummalāgudem plates, set II—(3) the Kandulapalem plates—his acc. 556-57 A.D.—as a boy prince enthroned by the council of ministers—his weakness—loss of territories—Pallava Siṁhavarman's aggression of Vēṅgī in 566-67 A.D. transfer of capital—aggression vacated—Pṛītivīmūla's help—Vikramēndra's religious policy—titles—marriage alliance with Siṁhavishṇu of Kāñchī.

(ii) Mādhavavarman IV : The Polamuru plates, set I—date of the charter. 612 A.D.—governorship of Gōvindavarman II—Mādhavavarman's acc. c. 564-65 A.D.—successor of Vikramēndravarman II *Jānāśrayī Chhandōvichiti* on Mādhavavarman IV—his titles—expedition to the east—sudden death—foreign intervention—a parellel in the Eastern Chālukyan history—Mādhavavarman IV, patron of letters.

References and Notes.

CHAPTER VII : FEUDATORIES OF THE VISHṆUKUṆḌIS : Pages 94-109.

(i) The Pṛithivīmūlas : (1-2) The Godavari Plates, sets I, and II—(3) the Tummalagudem plates, set II—Pṛitihvīmūla I, father-in-law and feudatory of Gōvindavarman—Parabhākaramahārāja—his independence—Pṛithivīmūla II—head of confedaracy fought against Indrabhaṭṭāraka—his ally Indrādhirāja—Harivarman—fedual status revived—Śrīmūla—end of the family.

(ii) The Gaṅgas : Rise of the family in Kaliṅga marked with an era 496-98 A.D.—reluctance to bear the Vishṇukuṇḍi yoke—(1) the Godavari plates, set I—Indrādhiraja identical with Indravarman I—(2) the Jirjingi plates—Mitavarman, contemporary of Mādhavavarman II—Indravarman I and Indrabhaṭṭāraka—Sāmantavarman—

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Hastivarman—Indravarman II—independence of the family—invasion of Kaliṅga by Mādhavavarman IV—593-624 A.D., dark period in Gaṅga history.

(iii) The Rāmakāśyapas : Family of chiefs of Pishṭapura of the Rāmakāśyapa *gotra*—(1) the Tāṇḍivāḍa grant (2) the Gōllāvalli grant—final independence of the family between 612 A.D. and 616 A.D.—*Mahārāja* Raṇadurja and his rebellion against Vikramēndravarman I—his defeat by the suzerian Indrabhaṭṭāraka—Vikramēndra, the Rāmakāśyapa and the overlord Vikramēndravarman II, the Vishṇukuṇḍi—Pṛithivīmahārāja aad Mādhavavarman IV—the former stripped of Pishṭapura by Pulakēśi II—disappearance of the family.

References and Notes.

CHAPTER VIII : ADVENT OF NEW POWER : Pages 110-129.

(i) Sources : (1) The Māruṭūra grant—(2) the Aihole *praśasti*—the Polamuru plates, set II.

(ii) Chālukyan Occupation of Vēṅgī : Conquest of Pulakēśi I, Kīrttivarman Maṅgalēśa—their relation with the Vishṇukuṇḍis—confusion in Bādāmi kingdom—invasion by Appāyika and Gōvinda the latter a Vishṇukuṇḍi prince—tact of Pulakēśi II—his triumphal compaigns—anarchy in Vēṅgī—Pulakēśi's—capture of Pishṭapura and Vēṅgī.

(iii) Pulakēśi II and Pṛithivīyuvarāja : Battle of Kolēru—(1) the Chezerla inscription—four parts—Kandararaja of the Ananda family—his daughter Avanitalāntavatī—her son Pṛithivīyuvarāja—his grant from the Kōlissaras—titles—temples of Achalēśvara, Kapōtēśvara built by Kapōta—Pṛithivīyuvarāja, feudatory of Pallava Mahēndravarman I—date of the Chezerla record—(2) the Kopparam plates of Pulakēśi II—*ājñapti* of Pṛithivīduvarāja, identical with Pṛithivīyuvarāja—Hultzsch's theory—Aihole *praśasti* on the Chālukya-Pallava conflict—Pṛithivīyu(du)varāja's part—Chālukyan conquest of Guntur Dt.

References and Notes.

CHAPTER IX : ADMINISTRATION AND SOCIETY : Pages 130-140.

Scarcity of source material.

(i) Administration : (1) Administrative divisions—(2) the king—supreme power—curbs—royal titles—(3) Royal family—(4) Officers and Administrative Arrangements—council of ministers—its duty—*ājñapti* or *ājña—adhikārapurusha—dūta—kāyastha—vallabha—sāndhivigrahika—hastikōśa – virakōśa—chāra— bhata – rāshṭrakūṭa —vishayamahattara—grāmavṛiddha*—(5) State Revenue—war booties —taxes—*kara—bhāga—bhōga – dāna—daṇḍa*— other incomes—(6) Public Expenditure – construction of buildings, temples etc.—

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

sacrifices—defence—(7) Coinage—types of coins—(8) Military—Administration—wars—incentive and honour to soldiers war—elephants—fortresses—war morality—four-fold *upāyas*—(9) Judiciary—*Dharma* superior to *Artha*—ordeals.

(ii) Society : (1) Four-fold Division—early Andhra society—(2) Women—(3) Village Life—agriculture—*grāma-vṛiddha*—village council—temple council—position of individual villagers—heads of families—village boundaries contributions to royal battalion—forced or free labour—*agrahāra* and *bhaṭṭagrāma*—gifts named after the donors.

References and Notes.

CHAPTER X : RELIGION, EDUCATION, ART AND ARCHITECTURE UNDER THE VISHṆUKUṆḌI : Pages 141-152.

(i) Religion : Three major religions—(1) Hinduism—triumph of the *sanātana-dharma*—worship of the Śaiva and Vaishṇava gods—(2) Buddhism—earlier monasteries—Yuvan Chwang's reference—vigor of Buddhism—royal patronage—*Mahāyāna* ethics—Bōdhisattva doctrin—convertion to Buddhism—three *Yānas*—monks of beylon—Jainism—Musinikoṇḍa grant.

(ii) Education : Scholar kings—high qualifications of the donees—popularity of different Vēdic *śākhās* and *sūtras*—colonisation of the Atharvan teachers—study of epics, and *Dharma-śāstra—Sahasra—Aśīti-tarka—Sahasra-tarka—Viṁśati—Chatuḥ-shashṭi—ghaṭikās*—classical literature—language of the Vishṇukuṇḍi records.

(iii) Art and Architecture : Earlier monuments—builders among the Vishnukundis cave temples of the period—different theories—unique cave temple of the Vishṇukuṇḍi—Kapōtēśvara temple—Longhurst's view—evidence of the Chezerla inscription—iconography.

References and Notes.

PART II : INSCRIPTIONS :

A—INSCRIPTIONS OF THE VISHṆUKUṆḌIS

		Pages
No. I :	Tummalagudem Plates (Set I) of Gōvindavarman I, Year 37.	152-156
No. II :	Velpuru Pillar Inscription of Mādhavavarman II, Year 33.	157-158
No. III :	Īpur Plates (Set I) of Mādhavavarman, Year 37.	159-160
No. IV :	Khanapur Plates of the Time of Mādhavavarman II.	161-163
No. V :	Īpur Plates (Set II) of Mādhavavarman III, Year 47.	164-165
No. VI :	Ramatirtham Plates of Indravarman, Year 27.	166-168
No. VII :	Chikkulla Plates of Vikramēndravarman II, Year 10.	169-171
No. VIII :	Tummalagudem Plates (Set II) of Vikramēndravarman II, Year 11, Śaka 488	172-175

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

No. IX : Kandulapalem Plates of Vikramēndravarman II, Year 14. 176-177
No. X : Polamuru Plates (Set I) of Mādhavavarman IV, Year 48. 178-181

B

INSCRIPTIONS OF THE FEUDATORIES AND SUCCESSORS OF THE VISHṆUKUṆḌIS

No. XI. : Godavari Plates (Set I) of Pṛithivīmūla, Year 25. 182-184
No. XII : Godavari Plates (Set II) of Pṛithivīmūla. 185-187
No. XIII : Jirjiṅgi Plates of the Gaṅga Indravarman, I, Year 39. 188-189
No. XIV : Tāṇḍivāda Grant of Pṛithivīmahārāja, Year 46. 190-191
No. XV : Gōllāvalli Grant of Pṛithivīmahārāja, Year 49. 192-193
No. XVI : Māruṭūra Grant of [Pulakēśi II], Year 8. 194-197
No. XVII : Polamūru Plates (Set II) of the Eastern Chālukya Jayasiṁha I, Year 5. 198-199
No. XVIII : Chezerla Stone Inscription of the Time of Mahēndra-vikrama-Mahārāja And Pṛithivīyuvarāja. 200-204

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I : THE ŚRĪPARVATĪYA ANDHRAS : Pages 205-210

Śrīparvatīya Andhras of the Purāṇas—theories of their identification with the Chuṭus—with the Ikshvākus—reasons in support of the former identification—(i) Chuṭu coins—(ii) Conventional meaning of 'Śrīparvata'—(iii) the Śrīparvata of the Nagarjunakonda inscription—(iv) evidences of the Ābhīra and the Sātavāhana inscriptions—(v) meaning of the Suffix chha of *Śrīparvatīya*—(vi) dynastic title—*Aṇdhṛa*—(vii) the Purāṇic context.

References and Notes.

APPENDIX II : BRAHMA-KSHATRA : Pages 211-212.

Kadamba king Kāmadēva's Copper Plate grant and the Brahma-kshatra-vaṁśa—theory of intercaste marriage—objections.

References and Notes.

APPENDIX III : SACRIFICES AND TITLES OF MĀDHAVAVARMAN II : Pages 213-223.

(i) The Sacrifices :- List of Mādhavavarman's sacrifices—1. *Prājāpatya*—2. *Agnishṭōmasahasra* or *Kratusahasra*—3. *Purushamēdha*—4. *Sarvamēdha*—5. *Bahusuvarṇ-aikādaśa*—6. *Ekadaśa-Pauṇḍarīka*—significance of *ēkādaśa*— 7. *Ekadaś-Aśvamēdha*—alleged difficulties in admitting this claim—answers real difficulty—theory of multiplication of *dakshiṇā*—two solutions—why '*ēkādaśa*—8. *Rājasūya-prādhirajya*—etc.

(ii) The Titles of Mādhavavarman :- Meaning of *pāramēshṭhyadēvātidēva—susthirakarman.*

References and Notes.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

APPENDIX IV : (TRIVARANAGARA : Pages 224-230.

Mādhavavarman's title *Trivaranagarabhavana* etc.—five different schools explaining it—unpopularity of the first and third schools—the popular fourth school of Trivaranagara—Pāṇḍava (of South Kōsala) capital equation—difficulties—Śailōdbhava inscriptions—Vishṇukuṇḍi Chronology—palaeography of the Pāṇḍava records—chronology of the South Kōsala kings—Bālārjuna's Sirpur inscriptions—fifth school—real solution in the second school of Dr. Hultzsch—Trivaranagara, identical with Tiruvūru.

References and Notes.

APPENDIX V : TRIKŪTA-MALAY-ĀDHIPATI : Pages 231-235.

Five schools of identifying the Trikūṭa and Malaya of the title of Mādhavavarman III—the theory of the Trikūṭa=Kōṭappakoṇḍa equation—Trikūṭa s.a. the one in Aparānta—theory of Skt. *Malaya* =Dravidian *Malai*—a parellel claim of Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi to be the lord of Malaya—common solution—poetic tradition locating one of the four Malayas in Andhra—Malayāvani in the West Godavari Dt.

References and Notes.

APPENDIX VI : GHAṬIKĀ : Pages 236-238.

Ghaṭikā in the title of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman—Kielhorn's explanation—*ghaṭikā* denotes educational institution—significance of the name *ghaṭikā* Kumarilabhaṭṭa's evidence—Mayūraśarman and the *ghaṭikā* of Kñnchĭ—*ghaṭikā* and village assembly—Uttaramerur inscription.

References and Notes.

APPENDIX VII : DAŚAŚATA-SAKALA-DHARAṆĪTALA : Pages 239-247.

The unique title *Daśaśata-sakala-dharaṇī-tala-narapati* of Mādhavavarman IV—two views prevalent—unnecessary emendation by the first view—*Daśaśata-sakala-dharaṇī-tala-Vēṅgī sahasra* country equation by the second view—objections—solution in the literary tradition—evidences of Kauṭilya and Rājaśēkhara—Vayalur inscription.

References and Notes.

APPENDIX VIII : AVASITA-VIVIDHA-DIVYA ETC. : Pages 242-244.

Splitting of the passage *avasita———ratiḥ* into two titles of Mādhavavarman IV—the prevalent explanation of the first title *avasita-vividha-divya*—objections—two new explanations basing on the literary traditions—the entire passage as a single epithet.

References and Notes.

Bibliography

Index

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CHAPTER I

PROLEGOMENA

THE centuries that followed the decline and fall of the mighty empire of the Sātavāhanas in the third century A.D., and preceded the rise of the equally mighty empire of the Chālukyas in the sixth century, witnessed the rise and fall of many dynasties—both great and small—in the Deccan. Among them, the dynasty of the Vishṇukuṇḍis occupied a unique position. For, in point of power and influence on the contemporary politics of the Deccan, the Vishṇukuṇḍis came next only to the Vākāṭakas. Again, while the house of the Vishṇukuṇḍis, as shown below, represented an offshoot of the Chuṭu Sātakarṇis who served directly under the Sātavāhanas, the later members of the family were the contemporaries of the early members of the Chālukya dynasty. So, for all practical purpose, the family of the Vishṇukuṇḍis may be regarded as a connecting link between the said two dynasties of the ancient and the medieval ages.

(i) NAME OF THE DYNASTY

As a preliminary to our study it may be worthwhile to decide the correct spelling of the name of the dynasty. In the epigraphs of the family, the dynastic name occurs not less than fifteen times.[1] Out of them, in eight cases[2] it is found in compound expressions, and in one place[3] its reading is doubtful. In other instances[4] the name occurs in the plural form of the genitive case. In the Chikkulla plates, the first among the records of the family to be discovered and edited, it occurs as *Vishṇukuṇḍinām*. Dr. Kielhorn, the editor of this record, naturally took the name of the family to be Vishṇukuṇḍin, with *n*-ending. Dr. Hultzsch who edited next the Ipur charter (I) read the name as *Vishṇukuṇḍinām* in the text, but with the significant remark that the sign for the medial *i* in what was read as *ṇḍi* appeared to be that for the medial *ī*.[5] Again the correct reading of the name in the Polamuru plates seems to be °*ṇḍīnām*,[6] though some have read it as °*ṇḍinō*.[7] In the Kandulapalem plates also the reading is only *Vishṇukuṇḍīnām* but the editor of that record corrected it into *Vishṇukuṇḍīnām*.[8] All these are evidently due to the thinking that all the other texts should fall in line with the Chikkulla text. Besides, in both the sets of the Tummalagudem plates, recently discovered, the reading *Vishṇukuṇḍīnām* is beyond doubt. Thus, the *i*-ending of the name is denoted by five records while *n*-ending is favoured only by the solitary Chikkulla charter the language of which, at the same time, is "very incorrect" as Prof. Kielhorn has remarked. Hence, it would be logical to spell the name of the dynasty as *VISHṆUKUṆḌI* and not as *VISHṆUKUṆḌIN* as has been hitherto done by scholars.[9]

(ii) GENEALOGY AND CHRONOLOGY

The problems of the Vishṇukuṇḍi genealogy and chronology have evaded a satisfactory solution in spite of the repeated attempts of scholars for sixty years

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

past.[10] There are four major theories offered by scholars who have dealt with the problem. For the sake of convenience they may be referred to here as Theory I, Theory II, Theory III and Theory IV. All these theories centre around the following genealogies furnished by the copper-plate charters of the family :

I

CHIKKULLA PLATES[11]

1. Mādhavavarman (Performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas*, *Kratusahasra* and other sacrifices)
2. Vikramēndravarman I
3. Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman
4. Vikramēndravarman II

II

RAMATIRTHAM PLATES

1. Mādhavavarman (Performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas*, *Kratusahasra* and other sacrifices)
2. Vikramēndravarman
3. Indravarman

III

POLAMURU PLATES : (Set I)

1. Vikramahēndravarman
2. Gōvindavarman *Vikramāśraya*
3. Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* (Performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas*, *Kratusahasra* and other sacrifices)

IV

IPUR PLATES : (Set I)

1. Gōvindavarman
2. Mādhavavarman (Performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas*, *Agnishṭomas-ahasra* and other sacrifices)

V

IPUR PLATES : (Set II)

1. Mādhavavarman I (Performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas*, *Agnishṭōmas-ahasra* and other sacrifices)
2. Dēvavarman
3. Mādhavavarman II

The Theory I was proposed by Sri H. Krishna Sastri in 1914[12] and it was finalised in 1920.[13] Taking into account the palaeography alone, the above five charters are arranged in this Theory, in the following chronological order :

1. Ipur plates, set II ;
2. Ipur plates, set I ;
3. Ramatirtham plates ;
4. Chikkulla plates ; and
5. Polamuru plates, set I.

Accordingly, the following is suggested in this Theory : (i) Mādhavavarman, the issuer of the Ipur set II might have been the grandfather of Mādhavavarman of the Ipur set I. (ii) The latter was identical with his namesake of the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham plates. (iii) Vikramahēndravarman of the Polamuru plates (I) may be identical[14] with Vikramēndravarman II of the Chikkulla charter. In this connection it has been also pointed out that the later nature of the characters of the Polamuru plates (I) and the occurrence of the titles *Vikramāśraya* and *Janāśraya*, borne respectively by Gōvindavarman and Mādhavavarman in that charter establish that these kings were different respectively from their namesakes of the Ipur set I and that they

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

were probably successors of Vikramēndravarman II of the Chikkulla record. Thus, the genealogical scheme as per Theory I would be like this :

1. Mādhavavarman I (Performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and other sacrifices)
2. Dēvavarman
3. Mādhavavarman II (Issuer of the Ipur set II)
4. Gōvindavarman I
5. Mādhavavarman III (Performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and other sacrifices and issuer of the Ipur set I)
6. VikramēndravarmanI
7. Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman (Issuer of the Ramatirtham plates)
8. Vikramēndravarman II (Issuer of the Chikkulla plates)
9. Gōvindavarman II *Vikramāśraya*
10. Mādhavavarman IV *Janāśraya* (Performer of eleven *Aśvamedhas* and other sacrifices and (issuer of the Polamuru plates)

Thus, as per this Theory there would be altogether four Mādhavavarmans in this family, three of them being performers of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* etc. Later, while editing the two sets of the Ipur plates in 1924, Dr. Hultzsch did not utter a word about the rulers Nos. 9 and 10 of the above genealogy. Yet, he accepted the above genealogical scheme upto Vikramēndravarman II of the Chikkulla plates. He added the following two important statements in this connection : (i) The characters of the Ipur set I are decidedly earlier than that of the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham plates.[15] (ii) The characters of the Ipur set II resemble those of the British Museum Prakrit charter of the Pallava queen Chārudēvī [16] (*i e.*, of about the middle of the 4th century A.D.)[17] and therefore Mādhavavarman of the Ipur set I might have been the grandson of Mādhavavarman II of the Ipur set II, the grandson being named after the grandfather.[18] While writing in 1920 itself, G. Jouveau-Dubreuil was obviously not aware of the two Ipur sets. Yet, he endorsed the Theory I and identified[19] Vikramahēndravarman of the Polamuru plates with Vikramēndravarman II of the Chikkulla charter.

The Theory II was propounded by K.V. Lakshman Rao in 1924.[20] This scholar suggested two corrections in the above Theory I. He identified (i) Mādhavavarman II of the Ipur set II with his namesake of the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham plates ; and (ii) Gōvindavarman and Mādhavavarman of the Ipur set I with their respective namesakes of the Polamuru record. Thus, the genealogical scheme, according to this Theory, consisting of three Mādhavavarmans, all distinguished by the performance of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* etc., is as follows :[21]

1. Mādhavavarman I (Performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and other sacrifices)
2. Dēvavarman
3. Mādhavarman II—(Issuer of the Ipur set II and the performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and other sacrifices)
4. Vikramēndravarman I
5. Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman (Issuer of the Ramatirtham plates)
6. Vikramēndravarman II (Issuer of the Chikkulla plates)
7. Gōvindavarman
8. Mādhavavarman III (Issuer of the Ipur set I and the Polamuru set I and the performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and other sacrifices)
9. Mañchyaṇṇabhaṭṭāraka (The *ājñapti* of the Ipur set I)

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Later, in 1933, Dr. D.C. Sircar offered the Theory III.[22] His arguments are as follows : The first Mādhavavarman of the Ipur set II and all his namesakes of all the other charters of the family claim to have performed exactly an equal number of the same sacrifices, *viz.*, eleven *Aśvamēdhas*, one thousand *Agnishṭōmas*, etc. Therefore, all of them, must have been one and the same and must have been identical with that Mādhavavarman who was the great-grandfather of Vikramēndravarman II of the Chikkulla plates. So, this scholar stressed that it is "almost impossible that there can be more than one Mādhavavarman, the performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and thousand *Agnishṭōmas*, in the same period."[23] Accordingly, the conclusions of this theory are : (i) Both the Ipur (set I) and Polamuru (set I) charters were issued by that Mādhavavarman who was the great-grandfather (and not grandson as in the scheme of the Theory II) of Vikramēndravarman II of the Chikkulla charter. (ii) Mādhavavarman II of the Ipur set II and Indravarman of the Ramatirtham plates were two grandsons of that Mādhavavarman through different sons. (iii) Vikramēndravarman II of the Chikkulla plates was the last known ruler of the dynasty. Hence, this Theory III proposes the following genealogical tree of the family :[21]

Vikramahēndravarman
(*i.e.*, Vikramēndravarman I)
|
Gōvindavarman *Vikramāśraya*
|
Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya*
(Performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and one thousand *Agnishṭōmas* and the issuer of the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) plates)

Dēvavarman	Vikramēndravarman II	Mañchyaṇṇa-bhaṭṭāraka
Mādhavavarman II (Issuer of the Ipur set II)	Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman (Issuer of the Rama-tirtham plates)	
	Vikramēndravarman III (Issuer of the Chikkulla plates)	

Now by way of answering the question of the later nature of the characters of the Polamuru set I it is said that the record may be a later copy of an earlier original.[25] Regarding the two statements of Hultzsch on the relative positions of the two sets of the Ipur charters in point of time, it is affirmed that the difference is due to different scribes.[26]

As against the above Theory III, the Theory IV was proposed in 1936. The arguments of the authors of this theory, *viz.*, Sri R.S. Panchamukhi, Prof. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri, etc., are as follows :[27] While stressing too much on the common epithets (*i.e. sāmānya-dharma*) referring to eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and one thousand *Agnishṭōmas* etc., of Mādhvavarman I of the Ipur set II and Mādhavavarmans of other Vishṇukuṇḍi records, the author of the Theory III has failed to give due weight to the new and distinguishing epithets (*vyāvarttaka-dharmas*), like *Hiraṇyagarbha-*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

prasūta, and *Trivaranagara-bhavana-gata-yuvati-hṛidaya-nandana* borne only by Mādhavavarmans of the Ipur set I and the Polamuru set I. These last mentioned epithets, it is believed, indicate (i) that these two Mādhavavarmans, who assumed these titles, and who were the sons of Gōvindavarman, must have been identical; and (ii) that he must have been different from his namesakes of all the other Vishṇukuṇḍi charters.[28]

Moreover, a comparative study of the respective grant portions of the Polamuru set I of Mādhavavarman and the Polamuru set II of the Eastern Chālukya Jayasiṁha would reveal that the donee of the latter charter was the son of the donee of the former one ; and that therefore the interval between the dates of these two charters could not have been much longer than one generation. Consequently Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru set I and the Ipur set I is to be placed slightly before the Chālukyan conquest of Vēṅgī,[29] and after Vikramēndravarman II of the Chikkulla charter, who therefore may be identical with Vikramahēndravarman of the Polamuru set I.[30]

Again, questions[31] are raised against the Theory II also which identifies Mādhavavarman, the issuer of the Ipur set II with his namesakes of the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham plates. In this context it is pointed out that while the former Mādhavavarman was a *Trikūṭa-Malayādhipati*, but not a performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and other sacrifices, the case was quite the reverse with the other Mādhavavarman. Therefore Mādhavavarman I of the Ipur set II has to be identified with his namesake of the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham plates. On the basis of the above reasoning the following genealogical table has been constructed :[32]

Mādhavavarman
(Performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and other sacrifices)

Dēvavarman
Mādhavavarman II
(Issuer of the Ipur set II)

Vikramēndravarman I
Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman
(Issuer of the Ramatirtham plates)
Vikramēndravarman II
(Issuer of the Chikkulla plates)
Gōvindavarman *Vikramāśraya*
Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya*
(Performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and other sacrifices and issuer of the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) plates)
Mañchyaṇṇabhaṭṭāraka
(*Ājñapti* of the Ipur set I)

Now arises a problem. How to account for (i) the palaeographical discrepancy and (ii) the duplication of Mādhavavarmans who claim to have performed an equal number of the same sacrifices ? Regarding the first question it is remarked that it is

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

not easy to fix up, within a century or so, or even more, on simply palaeographical grounds, the time of an undated record. And the second question is explained away by saying that the epithets like *ēkādaśāśvamēdha* etc., *agnishṭōmasahasra* etc., seem to be mostly rhetoric and conventional attributes ; and that these epithets, originally of the earlier Mādhavavarman, must have been appropriated by his later namesake who had also his own distinguishing titles, like *Hiraṇyagarbha-prasūta* etc.[33]

Of the four Theories studied so far, the first two have become obsolete[34] while the remaining two Theories alone hold the field at present. Now among the students of the Indian History, some hold[35] on to the Theory III while some others adhere[36] to the Theory IV. Before examining the relative strength and weakness of these Theories, it will be useful to study the next part of our problem, *viz.*, the chronology of the Vishṇukuṇḍis.

As we have seen earlier, Dr. Hultzsch compared the characters of the Ipur set II with those of the British Museum Prakrit charter of the Pallava queen Chārudēvī. He had thus indicated[37] the upper limit of the age of the Vishṇukuṇḍis, *viz.*, the second half of the 4th century A.D. Similarly, Dubreuil assigned the Polamuru set I to a period shortly before the Chālukyan conquest of the coastal Andhra[38] and had thus suggested a sort of working hypothesis for the construction of a chronological scheme for the family. Evidently taking both these clues and perhaps by tagging Dubreuil's suggestion with the statement that Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru set I "was the latest of the Vishṇukuṇḍi kings",[39] the upholders of the Theory II[40] had worked out a detailed chronological scheme in the following manner :

Mādhavavarman I	...	...	357-382 A.D. (25 years)
Dēvavarman I	...	...	382-407 A.D. (25 years)
Mādhavavarman II	...	...	407-444 A.D. (37 years)
Vikramēndravarman I	...	...	444-469 A.D. (25 years)
Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman	...	...	469-496 A.D. (27 years)
Vikramēndravarman II	...	...	496-521 A.D. (25 years)
Gōvindavarman *Vikramāśraya*	...	...	521-546 A.D. (25 years)
Mādhavavarman III *Janāśraya*	...	...	546-610 A.D. (65 years)[41]
Mañchyaṇṇabhaṭṭāraka	...	...	610 A.D.

Basing on the genealogical scheme of this Theory, the Vishṇukuṇḍi chronology comprising 250 years from c. 400 A.D. to 650 A.D.[42] has also been worked out by other scholars.

The propounders of the Theory III have made a necessary correction to the above scheme by pointing out that atleast upto the middle of the 5th century A.D., the Vēṅgī country was under the rule of the Sālaṅkāyanas and not of the Vishṇukuṇḍis.[43] However, the upholders of this Theory III assume this : (i) The time gap between the Polamuru set I and Polamuru set II was "about half a century". (ii) The fifth year of the Eastern Chālukya Jayasiṁha (*i.e.* the date of the latter record) corresponded to 637 A.D. (iii) The details of the date of the Polamuru set I might have fallen in 556 A.D., or 565 A.D., or 574 A.D. or 575 A.D. On the basis of these assumptions these scholars assign the accession of the issuer of the last mentioned charter to a period some time between 516 A.D. and 535 A.D. So to suit the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

genealogical scheme of the Theory an "approximate chronology" of the Vishṇukuṇḍi kings has been built up in the following manner :

1. Rise of the Vishṇukuṇḍi power	...	in the 5th century A.D.
2. Vikramēndravarman I	...	c. 500-520 A.D.
3. Gōvindavarman *Vikramāśraya*	...	c. 520-535 A.D.
4. Māḍhavavarman I *Janāśraya*	...	c. 535-585 A.D.
5. Mādhavavarman II	...	c. 585-615 A.D.
6. Vikramēndravarman II	...	c. 615-625 A.D.
7. Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman	...	c. 625-655 A.D.
8. Vikramēndravarman II	...	c. 655-670 A.D.

9. End of the dynasty about the close of the 7th century A.D. or sometime in the 8th century A.D.[44]

Naturally the above chronological scheme has led its author to assume further that it was either Mādhavavarman II or Vikramēndravarman II who was defeated by the Chālukyan conqueror Pulakēśi II.[45] So a series of explanations had to be offered to show that there was a prolonged continuance of the Vishṇukuṇḍi rule in the Vēṅgī area even after it was conquered by the Chālukyas.[46] Evidently to ward off the sharp criticism[47] of this untenable position[48] the author of this Theory has subsequently revised his scheme as follows :[49]

Vikramahēndra (°kramēndra)varman I (c. 500 A.D.)
|
Gōvindavarman *Vikramāśraya*
|
Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* I (c. 535-585 A.D.)
|
———————————————————————
| | |
Dēvavarman | Vikramēndravarman II | Mañchyaṇṇabhaṭṭāraka
| (c. 585-590 A.D.) |
| | |
Mādhavavarman II | Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman |
| (c. 590-620 A.D.) |
| | |
| Vikramēndravarman III |
| (c. 620-631 A D.) |

Now the author of this Theory holds that, on the basis of the Kopparam plates[50] the Chālukyan conquest of the Andhra country must be assigned to about 631 A.D. ; and that it was Vikramēndravarman III (not any of the earlier kings) who was conquered by the Chālukya Pulakēśi II. So, when the Kandulapalem plates dated in the 14th regnal year of Vikramēndravarman was published the said scholar was compelled to revise once again the above scheme of chronology also without however, changing the last date, in the following way :

Vikramēndravarman III	...	...	616-31 A.D. (not 620-31)
Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman	...	...	587-616 A.D. (not 590-620)
Vikramēndravarman II	...	...	585-87 A.D. (not 585-90)[51]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

On the other hand the authors of the Theory IV worked out the following chronological scheme to suit the genealogical table[52] of their Theory :

Mādhavavarman I (440-60 A.D.)

Dēvavarman	Vikramēndravarman I (460-80 A.D.)
Mādhavavarman II (48 years)	Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman (480-515 A.D.)
	Vikramēndravarman II (515-535 A.D.)
	Gōvindavarman (535-556 A.D.)
	Mādhavavarman III (556-616 A.D.)
	Mañchyaṇṇabhaṭṭāraka

As in the case of the Vishṇukuṇḍi genealogy, so in the case of the Vishṇukuṇḍi chronoiogy too the above two uncompromising views of the authors of the Theory III and the Theory IV are now in the field.[53] The views of other scholars, in spite of their mutual, differences, may be grouped under these two schemes.

From what has been studied so far it is clear that the problem of the Vishṇukuṇḍi genealogy and chronology is the problem of identification of Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru set I and that it is closely related to the date of the Chālukyan conquest of Vēṅgī and to the date of the Polamuru set II.

The source of strength of the genealogical scheme of the Theory III, is the very convincing arguments based on the epithets like *Ekadaś-Āśvamēdha* etc., which seem to point to the identity of Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru set I with Mādhavavarman of the Chikkulla plates. But the weakness of the theory lies in that it widens too much the gap between the dates of two sets of the Polamuru plates—50 years or even more.[54] This gap has to be justified only by means of elaborate arguments based on some assumptions and presumptions.[55] In fact the said gap may be still wider. For, if Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru set I was succeeded by the other kings of the Chikkulla list, then the Vishṇukuṇḍi rule must have continued for at least about 43 years[56] more, after the date of the Palamuru set I. Similarly before the date of the Polamuru set II, about 23 or 22 years of Eastern Chālukyan rule also must have elapsed.[57] Thus, the gap would be 43+23=66 years. So, this has to be once again explained away by suggesting that the Eastern Chālukya Kubja Vishṇuvardhana's regnal years were counted from about 614 A.D.[58] long before 631 A.D which, according to the Theory III, was the date of the Chālukyan conquest of the Andhra country.[59] But, if the other views according to which the counting of Vishnuvardhana's regnal years started only from 624 A.D.[60] or even as late as 631-32 A.D.[61] are proved to be correct, then the above stand may not be tenable at all. Thus, the genealogical scheme of the Theory III seems to suffer from chronological difficulty.

At the same time, the genealogical scheme of the Theory IV seems to have the capacity to stand the chronological test. As the 48th year of Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* is equated in this scheme with 616 A.D., the gap between the two sets of

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

the Polamuru plates would be only 38 years even if one takes 631 A.D. to be the starting point of Kubja Vishṇuvardhana's reign.[62] But it does suffer from lack of arguments to establish the probability and possibility of the existence of two Mādhavavarmans claiming eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and other sacrifices. It is futile to explain it away as a case of conventional appropriation of the earlier Mādhavavarman's purely hyperbolical and rhetorical titles by his later namesake. The question is this : Why among the later members of the family, Mādhavavarman alone, and not any one else, should appropriate such titles for himself.[63] Until a logical answer to this pertinent question is suggested, the Theory IV is bound to be characterised as "not completely convincing."[64]

On the other hand, if it is possible to work out a genealogical scheme in which Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* of the Polamuru set I, though claiming eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and *Agnishṭōmasahasra*, is to be accommodated necessarily in between the date of Vikramēndravarman II of the Chikkulla plates and that of the Chālukyan conquest of Vēṅgī ; and if that scheme itself could help us in finding out an answer to the question why the later Mādhavavarman alone, and not any other king, claimed such sacrifices like his earlier namesake ; then such a scheme should be acceptable to all including the authors of the Theories III and IV. Luckily, such a scheme seems to be possible, if we examine the two more Vishṇukuṇḍi records recently unearthed in Tummalagudem village in the Mahbubnagar District. Their contents may be summarised as follows :

The Tummalagudem set II is a charter issued by the Vishṇukuṇḍi king Vikramēndravarman II in his eleventh regnal year and Śaka 488 (=566-67 A.D.) granting a village in favour of the Buddhist clergy of a *vihāra* referred to as *Paramabhaṭṭārikāmahāvihāra* and stated to have been built by a certain Paramabhaṭṭārikāmahādēvī. The latter was the queen of one Gōvindarāja, a staunch Buddhist king of the Vishṇukuṇḍi family of the Śrīparvata and was a builder of many *vihāras*. Her son was Mādhavarāja noted for his aggressive wars. The introductory part of the charter furnishes the following genealogy of the Vishṇukuṇḍi kings :

1. Gōvindavarman (A staunch Buddhist and builder of many *vihāras*)
   |
2. Mādhavavarman (Performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and other sacrifices)
   |
3. Vikramēndravarman I
   |
4. Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman *Satyāśraya*
   |
5. Vikramēndravarman II *Uttamāśraya* (The issuer of the charter)

The above genealogy clearly indicates that the issuer of the charter was no other than his namesake who issued the Chikkulla plates. Again the identity of the description of Gōvindarāja in the grant portion with that of Gōvindavarman in the genealogical account indicates that both the persons were one and the same. Then it will follow that Mādhavarāja of the grant portion was identical with Mādhavavarman of the introductory part.[65]

The Tummalagudem set I was issued by a Vishṇukuṇḍi king called Gōvindavarman in his 37th regnal year, granting two villages in favour of the Buddhist

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

monks of the *vihāra* built by his queen Paramamahādēvī. It offers the following genealogy of the king's family :

1. Indravarman
   |
2. Mādhavavarman
   |
3. Gōvindavarman (The issuer of the charter, a staunch Buddhist and a builder of many *vihāras* etc.)

From this account it is sufficiently clear that the *vihāra*, its builder, the queen Paramamahādēvī and her husband who issued this charter, *viz.*, Gōvindavarman, are all identical with their respective counterparts of the Tummalagudem set II discussed above. Thus these two charters are complementary to one another in supplying the genealogy of the Vishṇukuṇḍis down to Vikramēndravarman II, which may be tabulated as follows :

1. Indravarman
   |
2. Mādhavavarman I
   |
3. Gōvindavarman, (Issuer of the Tummalagudem set I)
   |
4. Mādhavavarman II (Performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* etc.)
   |
5. Vikramēndravarman I
   |
6. Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman
   |
7. Vikramēndrabhaṭṭārakavarman (Issuer of the Tummalagudem set II).

It may be seen now that the king No. 4, in the above table, *viz.*, Mādhavavarman, the performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* etc., who was the grandfather of No. 6, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman (of the Ramatirtham plates) and the great-grandfather of No. 7 Vikramēndrabhaṭṭārakavarman (of the Chikkulla and Tummalagudem plates) had his grandfather in No. 2 by name Mādhavavarman.[66] But according to the list of kings given by the Polamuru set I, the grandfather of the king Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya,* the performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* etc., was not Mādhavavarman but was one Vikramahēndravarman. It is therefore obvious that Mādhavavarman of the Chikkulla list and Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru (I) list were different from one another and that there did exist, not only one, but two Mādhavavarmans claiming eleven *Aśvamēdhas*. One need not be afraid of the argument of the Theory III against such conclusion. (*Vāl-āgraśata-bhāgō'=pi na kalpyō nishramāṇakaḥ । pramāṇavanti kalpyāni vastūni subahūny=api ॥*)[67]

Now it remains to fix up, in the Vishṇukuṇḍi genealogy, the kings of the Polamuru (I) list. It has already been seen that, on the basis of its palaeography and its contents, this record has been assigned to a time after the date of the Chikkulla plates and just immediately before the Chālukyan conquest of Andhra. The later event took place about 616 A.D. as indicated by the Marutura grant of Pulakēśi II.[68] The details of the date of the actual grant of the Polamuru set I, *viz.*, lunar eclipse, Phālguna śu. 15 seem to correspond to the 22nd February, 612 A.D.[69] Therefore the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

48th year of Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* quoted in the Polamuru set I may be equated with 611-12 A.D. or 612-13 A.D.[70] Consequently the year of accession of that king may be fixed in 562-63 or 563-64 A.D. In this context the following three crucial points may be borne in mind.

(i) The period 562-64 A.D., fixed for the accession of Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* was earlier by 3 or 4 years than the date of the Tummalagudem plates set II of Vikramēndravarman II, *viz.*, Śaka 488 or 566-67 A.D. Thus the earlier regnal years of Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* seem to have overlapped with the reign-period of Vikramēndravarman II.

(ii) From the last mentioned inscription, dated also in the regnal year of Vikramēndravarman II, one may have to fix the accession of that king in 555-56 A.D. or 556-57 A.D.

(iii) Moreover the inscriptions of Vikramēndravarman II assert that the monarch was enthroned by the *prakṛiti-maṇḍala* or the council of ministers when he was still in his boyhood (*śaiśavē ēva*)—say about 16 years old. Therefore this king, who was only about 16 years old in 555-56 A.D., would have been about only 22 or 23 years old in 562-64 A.D., *viz.*, the date of accession of Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* arrived at above.

These factors are strong enough to indicate that Vikramēndravarman II of the Chikkulla and Tummalagudem (II) plates could not have been that Vikramēndravarman, the grandfather of Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* who ascended the throne as early as 562-63 A.D.[71] Thus the genealogical scheme of the Theory IV also seems to require a modification.[72] As the identification of Vikramēndravarman of the Polamuru set I with Vikramēndravarman II is out of question, the former may be identified with Vikramēndravarman I in as much as there may be no third king of that name among the known Vishṇukuṇḍi monarchs. In that case, both Vikramēndravarman II and Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* would be cousin brothers and hence would be more or less of the same age in 562-63 A.D., the year from which the latter's regnal years seem to have been counted.

Moreoever, from the fact that Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* started ruling earlier than the end of the rule of Vikramēndravarman II it is logical to deduce that the former started his career as a viceroy or feudatory of the latter over some principality since about 562 A.D. and on some time after the 14th regnal year of Vikramēndravarman II (*i.e* , the date of the Kandulapalem plates) *viz.*, after Śaka 491 or 569-70 A.D.—say near about 571 A.D.—he occupied the imperial throne. That he got the empire not from his father Gōvindavarman but from Vikramēndravarman himself seems to be hinted at by his own Polamuru charter.[73] Evidently to commemorate his independence, this Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya*, the son of Gōvindavarman II, performed horse sacrifices etc., imitating his illustrious namesake who was his great grandfather and was also the son of one Gōvindavarman. No other Vishṇukuṇḍi king who ruled in between these two Mādhavavarmans had any such occasion to perform those sacrifices. That is why among the successors of the Mādhavavarman II no king excepting Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* is found claiming *Aśvamēdhas*.

Now it is incumbent on us to identify those Mādhavavarmans who are mentioned in the two sets of Ipur plates as the performers of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* etc. We have already seen that Mādhavavarmans of the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) charters

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

The reign period (564-613 A.D.) allotted to Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* finds support from the work *Jānāśrayī Chhandōvichiti* of the period. For, it quotes from the poet Bhāravi, who has been generally assigned to about 550 A.D.[86] It is also corroborated by the Vizianagaram tradition that gives the date Śaka 514 (=592 A.D.) for a certain Mādhavavarman of the Andhra country.[87] Moreover, the total number of regnal years from the great king Mādhavavarman II down to the end of the fourth reputed king of that name is 40+25+29+18+48=160. This seems to explain a tradition recorded in the later age according to which there was a Mādhavavarman in Andhra ruling for 160 years.[88] Probably these traditions have mixed up the respective account of Mādhavavarman II and Mādhavavarman IV and have attributed from their own imagination so many deeds to that king, thus rendering his history beyond all points of recognition.[89]

Even after the recent discovery of the two sets of Tummalagudem plates some new theories have been advanced by scholars. One scholar presupposes the posteriority of the group of king of the Tummalagudem set I to that of the Tummalagudem set II and tries to accommodate the first group in between the dates of the last mentioned charter and of the Chālukyan conquest of Vēṅgī. But at the same time he feels helpless to decide the relationship between the first and the second groups of kings.[90] Believing in the anteriority of the first group of kings to that of the second group of the two sets of the Tummalagudem plates, another scholar[91] has offered two suggestions. One of them identifies Mādhavavarman and Gōvindavarman of the Tummalagudem set I respectively with Vikramahēndravarman and Gōvindavarman of the Polamuru set I, while the other one takes Gōvindavarman of the former record to be the father of Vikramahēndravarman of the later one. A third scholar[92] has identified Indravarman of the Tummalagudem set I with Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman of the Ramatirtham and Chikkulla plates.

These writers are evidently under the strong spell of the doctrine of single Mādhavavarman with eleven *Aśvamēdhas*, advocated on the Theory III, which, as shown above seems to suffer too much from chronological difficulties even if one does not take into account the new discoveries. Moreover, these schemes would assign the Polamuru set I to a period of about 520 A.D. and consequently widen up the hiatus between the date of that record and the date of the Polamuru set II (i.e., 633, 651 or 668 A.D.) by more than a century, a result which no one is likely to approve. Besides, these new theories are based on somewhat defective reading and interpretation of the text of the Tummalagudem sets.

In the light of the Theory IV some attempts have also been made to give different genealogical and chronological schemes,[93] ignoring the fact that Vikramahēndravarman of the Polamuru set I could not have been identical with Vikramēndravarman II of the Chikkulla plates.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. The name occurs in all the records of the family excepting the Khanapur plates. In Nos. VII, VIII and IX it occurs more than once.
2. I.e., in Nos. II, VI, VII, VIII and IX.
3. No. V.
4. Nos. I, III, VII, IX and X.
5. EI, XVII, p. 335.
6. In fact the reading here is *Vishṇukoṇḍīnām*. See also Ch. II, n. 57.
7. JDL, XI, p. 59 ; JAHRS, VI, p. 19 ; SS, p. 338.
8. EI, XXXVI, p. 11.
9. A similar error has also crept in the spelling of the name of the Western Chālukya king Pulakēśivallabha. The name occurs within compounds often. But in the Aihole inscription (v. 7) it is found in the Nominative singular. Dr. Fleet who first edited this inscription read the portion as *Polakēśiya* and corrected it into *°kēśī yaḥ* to honour grammar (IA, VIII, p. 241). While re-editing the record Kielhorn too read the portion containing the name as *°kēśi(śī) ya[ḥ*]* (EI, VI, p. 4). Consequently now the name of the monarch is spelt by all as Pulakēśin with *n*-ending. However an examination of the facsimiles of the record furnished by the above scholars would show that the reading of the passage is *Polakēśir-ya[ḥ*]* which is correct both metrically and grammatically and which indicates that the spelling of the name intended is Pulakēśi with *i*-ending. Similarly the Chālukya family is called *Chulutki(ki)kīnām-anvaya* in the Lohner plates of Pulakēśi II of Śaka 552 (EI, XXVII, p. 39, line 6). This indicates that according to the author of the record, the dynastic name was only Chulukiki with *i*-ending. But on the basis of the same record the modern writers are inclined to spell it as *Chulukikin* with *n*-ending (See CA, p. 227).
10. See below.
11. These five plates are enumerated here in the order in which they have been discovered and edited one by one. The Kandulapalem plates, discovered later, furnishes a genealogy which is identical with that of the Chikkulla plates.
12. ARE, 1914, p. 102.
13. Ibid., 1920, pp. 97 ff.
14. This identification suggested by Krishna Sastri with much hesitation and reservation (ARE, 1914, p. 102) was approved by Dubreuil (*The Pallavas*, p. 34 ; AHD, pp. 90-92).
15. EI, XVII, p. 335.
16. Ibid., VIII, pp. 143 ff.
17. Portion within brackets is mine.
18. EI, XVII, p. 338.
19. AHD, p. 90.
20. JDL, XI, pp. 31-62, the *Bhārati* (Telugu), Vol. VII, 1930, Sept. 463-80 and Vol. VIII, 1931, Feb., pp. 302-14.
21. This scheme had been approved by M.S. Sarma (JAHRS, V, pp. 180-85), Robert Sewell *HISI*, p. 404), R. Subba Rao, (JAHRS, VI, p. 19) and others. However some scholars (BRA & HA, pp. 114-15) continued to stick on to the earlier Theory.
22. IHQ, IX, pp. 273 ff ; JDL, XXVI, pp. 84 ff ; SS, pp. 97 ff.
23. SS, p. 102.
24. Ibid., p. 104 ; CA, p. 207.
25. SS, p. 131 n.
26. Ibid., p. 57.
27. EI, XXIII, pp. 91 ff ; IC, XV, pp. 15 ff ; etc
28. IC, XV, pp. 15-16 ; EI, XXIII, pp. 91 and n
29. I.e., as has been suggested by Dubreuil earlier (AHD, p. 92).
30. I.e., as has been suggested in the Theory I.
31. EI, XXIII, p. 95 ; IC, XV, p. 17 ; etc.
32. Ibid.
33. CA, p. 224.
34. QJMS, XXV, pp. 81 ff ; XXVI, pp. 142 ff ; See also ibid., XXV, pp. 299 ff; XXVII, pp. 231 ff.
35. See e.g. QJMS, XXX, pp. 62-63 ; APGAS, Nos. 8, 10 etc. See below.
36. See e.g. APGAS, No. 8, pp. 11 ff ; *Bhārati*, 1965, June, pp. 27 ff, etc.
37. EI, XVII, p. 338.
38. AHD, p. 92.
39. ARE, 1920, p. 98.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

40. JDL, XI, pp. 43 ff.
41. A reign of 65 years for this Mādhavavarman has been justified by equating the details of the date of the Polamuru set I, *viz.*, Phālguna śu. 15, lunar eclipse, 48th year with 594 A.D., February 10, and by taking that king to be the Vishṇukuṇḍi enemy of the Chālukyan conqueror in 610 A.D. (ibid.)
42. See QJMS, XXV, pp. 84-86.
43. SS, p. 102 n ; QJMS, XXV, pp. 300-01.
44. SS, pp. 110-12. It has also been pointed out that if Mādhavavarman, the younger, issued his charter only as a viceroy of his grandfather, his reign should be omitted and the succeeding reigns closed up. (ibid., pp. 392 and 398).
45. Ibid., p. 116.
46. Ibid., pp. 116 ff.
47. IC, XV, pp. 17-18; CA, p. 224 n.
48. That is perhaps why some scholars, though concurring (QJMS, XXX, pp. 62-63) with the Theory III in the genealogical scheme, had worked out chronological schemes of their own starting from 457-87 A.D. (for Vikramēndravarman I), passing through 517-65 A.D. (for Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya*) and ending in 605-15 A.D. (for Vikramēndravarman III). (ibid., pp. 70-71)
49. CA, 1962, p. 207.
50. EI, XVIII, pp. 257-60.
51. EI, XXXVI, p. 8.
52. IC, XV, p. 17 ; CA, p. 223. For slightly different chronological schemes worked out by different scholars of this school, see ED, pp. 418-21 ; EI, XXIII, p. 95 ; APGAS, No. 8, pp. 12-13.
53. See CA, pp. 206-07 and n. and pp. 223-24 and n.
54. SS, p. 110 and n.
55. Ibid., pp. 108-10.
56. I.e., 2 years of Mādhavavarman's son Vikramēndravarman+27 years of his son Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman+14 years of his son Vikramēndravarman II=43 years according to the latest arrangement (EI, XXXVI, p. 8).
57. I.e., 18 years of Kubja Vishṇuvardhana+5 years of his successor Jayasiṁha.
58. CA, pp. 251-52.
59. Ibid., p. 211.
60. JAHRS, IX, pt. iv., pp. 1 ff ; EC V, p. 55.
61. JOR, IX, pp. 17 ff.
62. I.e. [631 A.D.+Kubja Vishṇuvardhana's reign period of 18 years+Jayasiṁha's regnal years (recorded in the Polamuru set II) *viz.*, 5 years *minus* 616 A.D. (date of Polamuru set I)=] 654 A.D., *minus* 616 A.D.=38 years.
63. See QJMS, XXVII, p. 232 ; CA, p. 207 n.
64. A.L. Basham, JRAS, 1952, p. 83.
65. The difference between the names ending in °*varman* and those ending in °*rājan* makes infact no difference at all. For, Kīrttivarman, the father of the Chālukya king Pulakēśi II is at times called Kīrttirāja (IA, VIII, pp. 43 ff.). Again the Kadamba Ravivarman is also at times referred to as Ravimahārāja (see ASM, AR. EI, XXXVII, p. 34). Cf. JMU, XXXVIII, p. 230.
66. For other views on this point see below.
67. See the *Tarkabhāshā* (Ed. D.R. Bhandarkar), p. 193. In fact the author of the Theory III himself may be ready to believe in the existence of two such Mādhavavarmans provided there is evidence of a positive nature. See JAHRS, XI, p. 129.
68. See below Ch. VIII, sect. i.
69. See below Ch. VI, sect. ii.
70. This date certainly relieves one of the unnecessary assumption that the Polamuru set I may be a later copy of an earlier inscription.
71. Even accepting the theory that the date of the Chālukyan conquest of Vēṅgī was 631 A.D., and assuming that the 48th regnal year of Madhavavarman *Janāśraya* coincided with that year one cannot identify now Vikramahēndravarman of the Polamuru set I with Vikramēndravarman II of the Chikkulla plates and Tummalagudem (II) plates. For, if 631 A.D. was his 48th year, then Mādhavavarman's accession may have to be placed in 631 *minus* 48, *i.e.*, 583 A.D. As we have nothing to suggest that Mādhavavarman IV came to the throne as a minor, we may have to believe that he must have been at least 18 years old at the time of his accession. Accordingly he must have been born at least about (583 *minus* 18) 565 A.D., *i.e.*, when Vikramēndravarman II was only about 24 years old and was too young to have a grandson by that date.
72. See also below.
73. See below Ch. VI, sect. ii.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

74. See below Ch. IV ; Ch. VI, sect. ii.
75. EHAC, pp. 206-07.
76. IC, XV, p. 15.
77. Ibid., p. 18 ; CA, p. 224.
78. See EI, XXIII, pp. 92-93 ; CA, p. 224, etc.
79. CA, p. 209.
80. See below Ch. IV, sect. i.
81. For the probable period of this ruler see below Ch. V, sect. ii.
82. See below Ch. IV, sect. iii.
83. See below Ch. V, sect. iii.
84. See below Ch. VI, sect. ii.
85. See below Ch. VIII, sect. ii.
86. See below Ch. VI, sect . ii ; CA, p. 311.
87. *A Manual of Vizagapatam District*, p. 277.
88. JDL, XI, p. 56.
89. A parallel example may be found in the Tibetan and Chinese traditions that have mixed up the two respective accounts of one Nāgārjuna, the *Mādhyamika* of about the middle of the second century A.D., and the other Nāgārjuna, the *Tāntrika* of about the seventh century A.D. (See the *Sādhanamālā*, GOS, No. XLI, Introd. p. xlv) These traditions speak of a single Nāgārjuna living for 529 or 571 years (IHQ, VII, p. 637) and have added to the story so much from their imagination that it may lead the critics to doubt the very existence of a writer named Nāgārjuna. See M. Walleser, *The Life of Nāgārjuna from Tibetan and Chinese Sources* (Reprint from the *Asia Major*, Introductory Volume, Leipzig), p. 6.
90. JIH, XLIII, pp. 733-46; JMU, XXXVIII, pp. 229 ff.
91. JIH, XLIV, pp. 683-91.
92. JAHRS, XXXI, pp. 39 ff.
93. *Bhārati*, 1965, June, p. 28 ; Ibid., 1967, Nov., p. 34 ; JOI, XVI, pp. 375-81.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

sacrificial fire-pit.[26] But, the general practice of claiming fire-pit origin for a dynasty and naming it accordingly in one way or the other seems to belong to later ages as we find in the Paramāra records.[27] Again, *kuṇḍa* means generally 'a vessel' or 'a hole', and it may not yield the meaning 'fire-pit' without *agni* preceeding. Even the particular 'Vishṇu' of the *Mahābhārata* is only a fire-god for whom—and not in whom—oblations are offered in the fire-pit, on the New Moon and Full Moon days along with other gods.[28] Therefore, just as the fire-pits in which oblations are given to the gods Indra, Sōma, Rudra etc., are *Agni-kuṇḍas* only and may not be ordinarily called *Indra-kuṇḍa*, *Sōma-kuṇḍa*, *Rudra-kuṇḍa* etc., the fire-pit in which oblations are made for god Vishṇu may not also be called *Vishṇu-kuṇḍa*, even though that god happens to be a fire-god in the present case. Above all, the said theory of the fire-pit origin is obviously based on the assumption that the name of the family is Vishṇukuṇḍin, an assumption which has been already shown to have no justification.[29]

Another set of scholars connect the name Vishṇukuṇḍi with *Vishṇukuṇḍa*. Of them some view the latter as a Sanskritised form of *Vinukoṇḍa* referred to above,[30] and some others derive *Vinukoṇḍa* from *Vishṇukuṇḍi*.[31] There is also a theory[32] according to which the dynastic name Vishṇukuṇḍi is to be derived from the name Vishṇukuṇḍi of an alleged tributary of the Brahmakuṇḍi, which is another name of the river Guṇḍlakamma in the Guntur District. In this connection it is further presumed that a town by the side of that tributary might have acquired from that river the appellation 'Vishṇukuṇḍinapura' from which the ruling family adopted its name, and that the name of the town in course of time became Vinukoṇḍa.

But, it may be pointed out that no tributary river by name Vishṇukuṇḍi is known either from literature, or from inscriptions, or from tradition. Hence, such a river may have to be regarded as fictitious and it cannot form the basis for our enquiry. Moreover, it may be borne in mind that if the dynastic name is to be derived from the name of a geographical unit—be it a town, or a river, or a fire-pit —its expected form then would be not *Vishṇukuṇḍi*, but something like *Vaishṇukuṇḍika* with *ādi-vṛiddhi* (*i.e.* the conversion of the first vowel into *ā*, *ai* or *au*) just as *Traikūṭaka*,[33] *Paishṭapuraka*, *Vaiṅgēyaka*[34] etc. Thus, the absence of this *ādi-vṛiddhi* in *Vishṇukuṇḍi* seems to indicate that the name cannot be ordinarily derived from the name of a place. And at the same time, we have no authority to dub the form of the name as irregular and ungrammatical.[35] Moreover the name *Vinukoṇḍa*, *i.e.* *Vishṇukoṇḍa* (?), if viewed along with *Bhairavakoṇḍa* (a name of the hill which is famous for its early rock-cut shrines and which is not far off from Vinukoṇḍa) seems to give room for a doubt whether the former had anything to do with the dynastic name *Vishṇukuṇḍi*. Above all, as we have already seen, the original home of the Vishṇukuṇḍis was the Śrīparvata itself. They had their dynastic name *Vishṇukuṇḍi* even before they conquered the Vinukoṇḍa area, perhaps during the time of Mādhavavarman II.[36] Therefore it seems that, if at all *Vinukoṇḍa* had any connection with *Vishṇukuṇḍi*, then in all probability it is the place that got its name from the dynasty and not *vice versa*. That is why Prof. Kielhorn guardedly remarked, 'the word Vishṇukuṇḍi(n) survives in Vinukoṇḍa.'[37]

Some writers are of the opinion that the dynasty might have taken its name from the place of its origin Vishṇukuṇḍa, *i.e.*, Vinukoṇḍa, just like the Velanāṇṭis

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

and the Koṇḍapaḍumaṭi chiefs did.[38] True, the ruling classes, like the Pañchâlas, Aṅgas, Puṇḍras, Kambōjas, Chōḷas, Śakas, Kēraḷas, etc., are known to have appropriated for themselves, the names of their respective *janapadas* or countries,[39] and their names have no *ādi-vṛiddhi*. But, no dynasty seems to have taken its name from a city in that fashion. The examples of Velanāṇṭis and Koṇḍapaḍumaṭis actually support the view suggested above. For, they are formed only from the names of the *janapadas* and the Telugu Genitive case endings and therefore they mean 'the chiefs of Velanāḍu' and 'the chiefs of the Koṇḍapaḍumaṭi-dēśa'.[40]

So, the key that may unlock this problem seems to be this : It is well known that the descendants of the kings Raghu, Gupta, Vākāṭaka, Pallava, etc., were respectively known as the Raghus, Guptas, Vākāṭakas, Pallavas, etc., and that these names have a grammatical sanction.[41] We have already seen that *Vishṇukuṇḍīnām* of our records means 'of the Vishṇukuṇḍis', as in the case of *Pallavānām, Vākāṭakānām*, etc. Thus, it would appear that *Vishṇukuṇḍi* was considered to be the name of an individual and that the kings of the dynasty claimed to be the descendants of that person. If so, who was that person called Vishṇukuṇḍi ? It is indeed tempting to connect this Vishṇukuṇḍi with the kings Viṇhukaḍa (or °kaḍḍa) Chuṭukulānanda Sātakarṇis of the well-known Banavasi and Malavalli[42] inscriptions. It may not be unreasonable to take *Viṇhukaḍa* as a Prakritic equivalent of the Sanskritic *Vishṇukuṇḍi*, (*Viṇhukaḍa = Viṇhukuḍa = Vishṇukuṇḍa = Vishṇukuṇḍi*).[43]

True, while commenting on the above mentioned inscriptions Rapson took the three units of the king's name *viz.*, *Viṇhukaḍa*, *Chuṭukulānanda* and *Sātakarṇi* to be respectively the place name, the title from the clanish name Chuṭukula, and the dynastic name. He believed also that the personal name of the king is not mentioned in the epigraphs.[44] However, luckily for us there is another similar name that occurs in the recently discovered Nagarjunakonda inscription of the Ābhīra Vasushēṇa and seems to suggest the necessary correction to the above view. That name is *Vishṇurudra-Sivalānanda-Sātakarṇi*.[45]

Some writers have held that the last mentioned name of the Sātakarṇi contains names of gods, Vishṇu and Rudra-Śiva.[46] However it seems that in the said long name the first unit *Vishṇurudra* forms the personal name of the Sātakarṇi while *Śivalānanda*, the second unit, is his surname or title derived from the tribal name Śivala as in the case of *Muṇḍānanda*, of the coins.[47] That there did exist a tribe named Śivala has already been made known to us by some early coins of the Bow-and-Arrow-type from the southern Mahārāshṭra country.[48] Thus *Vishṇurudra-Śivalānanda-Sātakarṇi* seems to denote an individual, most probably a chief,[49] named Vishṇurudra who was born of the Sātakarṇi family and belonged to the Śivala tribe or clan.

On this analogy, the expression *Viṇhukaḍa-Chuṭukulānanda-Sātakarṇi* can be taken to denote only a king by name Viṇhukaḍa (*i.e.* Vishṇukuṇḍa or Vishṇukuṇḍi) born of the Sātakarṇi family who belonged to the Chuṭu clan.[50] *Kuṇḍa* like *Rudra* is recognised as a name of the god Śiva.[51] And it is known from the Malavalli Kallēśvara temple pillar inscriptions[52] and the Talagunda inscription,[53] that the Chuṭu Sātakarṇis were fervent worshippers of god Bhava (*i.e.* Śiva). Therefore *kuṇḍa* or *kuṇḍi* as a name of that god seems to fit in well in the name of the king of

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

their family. Moreover, *kuṇḍa* and *kuṇḍi*, perhaps synonyms[54] are also met with, as full-fledged personal names in the Śailōdbhava[55] records etc.[56] Thus the above name Viṇhukaḍa offers a good comparison to the name Vishṇurudra of the above Ābhīra inscription from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa. Similarly the name Vishṇukuṇḍi may also be compared with the name Skandakuṇḍi of a donee in the Hirahadagalli plates.[57] These arguments would suffice to show that Vishṇukuṇḍi of our records, Viṇhukaḍa (*i.e.* Vishṇukuṇḍa) of the Banavasi and Malavalli inscriptions and Vishṇurudra of the Ābhīra record probably belonged to one ethnical group that perhaps included the clans like Chuṭukula and Śivalakula.

One question may now be asked : While the names with *kaḍa*-ending like Dhañakaḍa, are known to be place-names, why *Viṇhukaḍa* should be taken as a personal name. Moreover, Rapson too has taken *Viṇhukaḍa* to be an equivalent to *Chuṭukaḍa* 'city of the Chuṭus'.[58] But this objection carries little weight in view of the following reasons :

In 1908, Rapson read, on the coins then at his disposal, *Dhuṭukaḷānanda* and conjecturally corrected it into *Chuṭukaḍānanda* and took *Chuṭukaḍa* to be a place name. But now we have got numerous Chuṭu coins on which the reading *Chuṭukula* is beyond doubt.[59] And that reading is supported by the Chuṭu inscriptions referred to above. So, what is intended by *Dhuṭukaḷānanda* of Rapson's coins may be *Chuṭukulānanda* only. Chuṭukula is the name of a clan or tribe and not of a place. Hence the *Viṇhukaḍa=Chuṭukaḍa* equation may not hold good now. Moreover, it is hardly convincing that the kings (or king)[60] of the Banavasi and Malavalli records were not inclined to mention their personal names, although at the same time, they were very particular to record their matronymics and the names of the place of their origin, their clan and their dynasty, as has been believed.[61] One's natural expectation, under such circumstances, would be to trace the king's proper name also. But, as we have seen earlier, no unit in the above legend of the king has a better claim to be his personal name than *Viṇhukaḍa* does. Such a claim of the latter is further strengthened by the compelling analogy of the name *Vishṇurudra—Śivalānanda Sātakarṇi*.

Again there are instances where both the personal names and the names of geographical units have common endings. For example *Upēndragiri*, *Dhanagiri*,[62] etc., *Ghṛitakuṇḍaka*[63] etc. and *Harshavardhana*, *Vishṇuvardhana* etc., are personal names ending respectively in *giri*, *kuṇḍa* and *vardhana*. At the same time we meet the place names with the same endings like *Mōragiri*,[64] etc. *Śrīkuṇḍa*,[65] etc. *Pauṇḍravardhana*,[66] *Bhōvagardhana*,[67] etc. In fact in the *Vāyupurāṇa* there figures a person bearing the name *Anādṛishṭikaḍa*[68]. Above all, it is not proposed to take *kaḍa* as a name-ending at all. Rather, it is treated here as an independent second unit of the *Dvandva* compound just as in the case of *Rudra* in the name *Vishṇurudra*, and *Hara* in *Harihara*. *Kaḍa* it self independently makes the name of an individual in an early inscription from Sāñchi according to Bühler.[69] The only new thing here is that it is believed to stand for the Sanskrit *kuṇḍa*.

Coming back to the name Vishṇukuṇḍi, it may be pointed out that it is also grammatically possible to take *Vishṇukuṇḍi* as a tribal name (instead of a family name) like *Ikshvāku*,[70] etc. But in that case too, we have to search for a person

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

called Vishṇukuṇḍi just as in the case of Ikshvāku tribe there was a person called Ikshvāku. Moreover, as we have already seen, the inscriptions place the names *Vishṇukuṇḍi* and *Vākāṭaka* in the same level and refer to both as *kula* or *vaṁśa*. Besides, the fact that the Vishṇukuṇḍis were unheard of after the Chālukyan conquest of Vēṅgī can be explained more satisfactorily by taking the name to be of a family and not of a tribe. For, it would be too much to assume that by the time of the Chālukyan conquest the whole tribe had become extinct.

A probable connection between *Viṇhukaḍa* and *Vishṇukuṇḍi* has earlier been thought of by other scholars also. But they dropped that idea. The 'serious objection', raised in this connection is this: While the ancient Chuṭu kings claimed *Mānavyasa-gōtra* and used the matronymic *Hāritiputra* and the title *Sātakarṇi* along with their names, the Vishṇukuṇḍis of the later age did not use any of them.[71] But, the kings like the Aira king Mānasada of the Velpuru inscription[72] and the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasēna I[73] had the matronymic *Hāritiputra*. The Kadamba kings of Mayūraśarman's line as well as the kings of the Chālukya family too did use the same matronymic and the same *gōtra* but in a slightly modified way. On that account nobody had ventured to suggest their blood connection with the Chuṭus. At the same time there are coins issued by the kings calling themselves Chuṭukulas, but using different or no matronymic.[74] In fact, the above mentioned appellations seem to have had some connection with the rulership or overlordship of the Kuntala or Vanavāsa country. That is perhaps why they were used successively by the Chuṭus, Kadambas and the Chālukyas who enjoyed in turn the rulership or overlordship of that territory. Having nothing to do with this area, the Vishṇukuṇḍis did not bear any of the above mentioned appellations. While the Chuṭus seem to have taken the dynastic title *Sātakarṇi* from their overlords, *viz.*, the Sātavāhanas, the Vishṇukuṇḍis were under different circumstances and had no such thing to inherit from their masters. Moreover, it may be remembered that while the Chuṭu king of the Malavalli inscription is assigned to the first quarter of the fourth century A.D., we have seen above that Indravarman I, the first known king of the Vishṇukuṇḍis was ruling about the last quarter of the same century. As the gap is only about half a century, the time factor can hardly come in the way of connecting the Vishṇukuṇḍis with the Chuṭus.

The above suggestion of the Chuṭu-Vishṇukuṇḍi connection seems to get further support from the symbol of the seals and coins of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. For example, the central figure on the seal of the Ipur set I, the earliest of the available seals of the dynasty, is exactly what we find above the figure of horse on some of the coins found in Anantapur District. The same symbol is found on the Chuṭu coins also.[75] Now it is immaterial for us whether this symbol represents Lakshmī or Svastika[76] or lion[77] or Nāga.[78] It may also be remembered that the same symbol is invariably found along with the representation of the lion in all the coins attributed to the Vishṇukuṇḍis. Therefore, it is very likely that the Vishṇukuṇḍis inherited or copied this symbol from their kinsmen, the Chuṭus. The lion emblem of Vishṇukuṇḍis, represented on the seals of their charters from Rāmatīrtham, Chikkulla etc., resembles those of the Kadambas,[79] the Telugu Chōḍas, the Pallavas,[80] etc. But the lion along with the above symbol, as on the Vishṇukuṇḍi coins are found on the obverse of some of the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Mahāraṭhi coins discovered in the Hyderabad area.[81] It is known that the Mahāraṭhis were the viceroys of the Andhras and were intimately connected with Chuṭus.[82]

(iii) SOCIAL STATUS OF THE VISHṆUKUṆḌIS

Not much has been stated by scholars regarding the social status of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. Those who propounded the theory of the fire-pit origin of the dynasty viewed the family to be that of the Agnikula-Kshatriyas.[83] As against this view, some have suggested that the Vishṇukuṇḍis were Brāhmaṇas. In support of this contention, they draw our attention to the epithet of Dēvavarman (in the Ipur set II) *viz.*, *Kshatriyāvaskanda-pravarttit-āpratima-vikhyāta-parākrama*, which is believed to indicate that the members of the family claimed to be superior to the Kshatriyas.[84] In this connection it must be borne in mind that the origin and caste of the great warriors who founded dynasties are often quite obscure,[85] and that in ancient India the royal nature or the Kshatriyahood of the kings was decided not by their Kshatriya-parentage alone. It was also often the result of their valour or their capacity to lead an army successfully.[86] Therefore it is hardly possible to be sure of the social status or caste of any royal family, let alone that of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. However, in the context of the Vishṇukuṇḍi history, we may try to study the problem on the basis of the available material.

For the purpose of our enquiry in this regard there are only two epithets to consider. The first one is the dynastic or tribal or clanish title *Andhrapati* by which a Vishṇukuṇḍi monarch is called in a record. The second one is the epithet *Brahmakshatra-tējōbhṛitām* applied to Vishṇukuṇḍis in general in the Tummalagudem set II. L.D. Barnett[87] and Dr. D.C. Sircar[88] etc., have dealt in detail with the social status of the people called Andhras in ancient India. Similarly the significance of the expression *Brahmakshatra* and other connected questions have been discussed at length by scholars like D.R. Bhandarkar,[89] Smith,[90] and Dr. Sircar.[91] Therefore only those points which are absolutely necessary for our study may be considered here.

The word *Andhra* in the title *Andhrapati* may mean either 'the Andhra country' or 'the people of that country' or 'the clan named Andhra'. We have already seen that neither the rulers of Pishṭapura nor the kings of the Sālaṅkāyana family, and nor even the Ikshvākus had been endowed with that title though they were ruling over the Andhra country and over the people of that country. It is clear, therefore, that the third meaning may be more appropriate to the context than the other two. Perhaps that was the reason why the *Purāṇas* call the Sātavāhanas only as the Andhras and not as the rulers of the Andhras. Again that is perhaps why the Nasik inscription of Puḷumāvi does not include the Andhra country in the list of countries ruled over by his father Siri Sātakarṇi, though there is hardly any doubt that the Andhra area formed part of his empire. Otherwise its omission from the list would be difficult to explain. In fact, as we shall see subsequently, the *Purāṇas* seem to suggest that the country Andhra derived its name from the king called Andhra.

It is well known that the *Bhavishya* section of the *Purāṇas* speak of the Andhras or Sātavāhanas as successors of the Kāṇvāyanas.[92] As the Sātavāhanas,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

the Chuṭus[93] and the Vishṇukuṇḍis alone seem to have been referred to as Andhras and Andhrapatis in the early age, the problem of determining the social status of all these families may be identical and hence it is to be studied here. In this connection it may be observed that the earlier sections of the *Purāṇas* speak also of a certain king Andhra. He, we are told, was one of the sons of the Kshatriya king Bali of the family of Anu,[94] or of Puru[95] both being the sons of Yayāti. From the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* we learn that this Andhra and his brothers Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Suṁha and Puṇḍra were born in the *kshētra* of Bali and they carved out their kingdoms after their respective names.[96] Accordingly this Andhra, the founder of the Andhra kingdom, and his descendants would be Kshatriyas. Most probably the Andhras of the *Bhavishya* section were deemed to have been the descendants of the said king Andhra.[97]

Now let us examine the next epithet *viz.*, *Brahmakshatra-tējōbhṛitām*. We know, from their own records, that the Vishṇukuṇḍis had performed innumerable Vēdic sacrifices. Significantly the *Brāhmaṇas* affirm that even a Kshatriya and Vaiśya obtain and retain the Brahminhood during the time of performing the Vēdic sacrifices.[98] We also know that the Vishṇukuṇḍis claimed to be just and sovereign rulers and that according to the *Smṛitis*, the sceptre of such rulers is made of *brahma-tējas*.[99] Hence there may be no difficulty in taking the title, under study, of the Vishṇukuṇḍis in these senses. But let it not be forgotten that, like the Vishṇukuṇḍis, the members of many other dynasties of ancient India are known to be just rulers and to have performed Vēdic sacrifices. But, only a few of them, not all, bore the above mentioned title or similar ones. So, one should not depend upon the *Brāhmaṇas* and *Smṛitis* in order to explain the title under study. However, the *Purāṇas* tell us that in the family of Puru both *Rājaṛishis* (*i.e.* great Kshatriya rulers) and *Brahmavaṁśīyas* (*i.e.* Brāhmaṇas) were born,[100] and that the family was a source of *Brahmakshatra*,[101] meaning 'Brāhmaṇas and Kshatriyas' or more probably 'Kshatriyas with Brahminhood'.[102] It may also be noted that a certain Vijaya of the family is described as *Brahmakshatrōttara* 'most superior among the Brahmakshatras'.[103] These facts indicate that the descendants of Puru including the said Andhra were designated as *Brahmakshatras*.

The *Purāṇas* also explain by means of a story, why the members of the family were so designated. The story goes: Formerly, the famous emperor Bharata, the son of Dushyanta of the family, had lost all his sons and therefore performed the *Marutstōma* sacrifice. Being pleased with it, the gods Maruts transferred to that monarch (*i.e.* caused him to adopt) one Bharadvāja, a Brāhmaṇa child of Mamatā and Bṛihaspati of the heavens.[104] This Brāhmaṇa Bharadvāja thus became a Kshatriya[105] and therefore he and his descendants were both Brāhmaṇas and Kshatriyas and were *dvyāmushyāyaṇa-kaulīnas*, *i.e.* members of a family of one who belonged to two sources, *viz.*, the Brāhmaṇa and Kshatriya.[106] In other words, they were known as Brahmakshatras or Brāhmaṇa-Kshatriyas. It may also be of interest to note, in this context, that another important authority too *viz.*, the *Saṅkarshakāṇḍa* of Jaimini, the author of the *Pūrvamīmāṁsāsūtras*, speaks of the *rāj-ōpēta-brāhmaṇas* and *brāhmaṇ-ōpēta-kshatriyas*,[107] denoting respectively Brāhmanas adopted as sons by the Kshatriyas and *vice-versa*.[108] Coming again to the *Purāṇas*, there are in the *Bhavi-*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

shaya section, statements, that a few Kshatriya rulers along with the Seven Sages (*Sapta Ṛishayaḥ*) remain at times as a source of the Brahma-kshatra progeny. They also say that in every aeon (*yugē yugē*) whenever the Kshatriya race is annihilated, a similar contact with the Brāhmaṇas is sanctioned by the traditional law (*smṛitaḥ*).[109]

If this background of the *Brahmakshatra-kula* and the fact that the progenitor of the Andhra dynasty belonged to that *kula* are borne in mind, then one may not be surprised to see the members of the Vishṇukuṇḍi branch of the Andhras claiming the *tējas* or brilliance of the *Brahmakshatra*. Similarly perhaps from the same background one may have to understand the significance of the epithet *Brahmakshatra-kulōdbhava* of the Pallava king Dantivarman.[110] Though there were kings bearing the same or similar epithet,[111] the Vishṇukuṇḍis appear to be the first to claim the Brahma-kshatra origin among the known kings of the historical period.

Now arises a question: If the Andhras were Brahmakshatras according to the *Purāṇas*, how to compromise it with the direct Purāṇic statement that the member of the dynasty who put down the last Kāṇvāyana was a *vṛishala* ?[112] But, it may be pointed out that it is the tradition recorded in the *Bhāgavata* that calls the said Andhra king a *vṛishala*, and according to the same authority, as we already saw, the founder of the Andhra family or clan was a son of Bali, the Paurava. So the word *vṛishala* may have to be taken in its literary sense 'one who destroys the *dharma i.e.* a wicked man',[113] and not in the sense of a person of the fourth caste. Otherwise, the *Purāṇa* would be contradicting itself (*ēka-vākyatā-bhaṅga*). It also deserves attention that the *Purāṇas* refer to the said Andhras as *sa-jātīya*[114] (*i.e.* of the same race) of the Kāṇvāyana (or Śuṅgas) whom he put down and who was evidently considered to be a descendant of that Kāṇvāyana, the grandson of Ajamīḍha of the Paurava family and to be consequently a Brāhmaṇa. Besides, an example from the *upanishads* may make the position clear. The word *śūdra*, though generally signifies a person of the fourth caste, is found applied to the famous king Jānaśruti in the *Chhandōgyōpanishad*.[115] Because the Kshatriyahood of that king is otherwise well established, authorities like Bādarāyaṇa, Śaṅkara, etc., have taken the word in the literary sense of 'a person full of grief.'[116] If we apply the same principle to the word *vṛishala* then there can be no objection if the Andhra kings (*Andhrapatis*) are designated as Brahma kshatras.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. EI, IV, p. 195.
2. ARE, 1909, p. 4.
3. Ibid., p. 109.
4. ARE, 1920, p. 99.
5. I.e., the capital of the Kalachuris (EI, VIII, p. 285).
6. I.e. the Ajanta inscription of Varāhadēva (CII, V, pp. 108 ff., text line 14). With the same view attempts have also been made to identify the said Trikūṭa, Malaya and "Amarapura" of the Ipur set II with Tagara, Mahēndragiri (Ganjam District) and Amroati (C.P.) respectively. See BRA & AH, pp. 111-12.
7. AIU, pp. 183-84.
8. Ibid., p. 225.
9. CA,. p. and 183, p. 272.
10. EI, XV, p. 267.
11. Ibid., p. 261. See also CII, V, pp. xiv-xv.
12. E.g., ED, p. 424.
13. Ibid., p. 425.
14. BRA & AH, p. 112; JDL, XI, p. 51; SS, p. 133.
15. ED, 430. In support of this theory our attention is drawn to a very hazy and late legend (ibid., p. 436 ff.).

15a. See below Ch. V, sect. ii.

16. The word *Pārvatēya (parvata*+the suffix *ḍhak*) is to be formed according to the rule *Tasy-ēdam* (PA, IV, iii, 123).
17. EI, IV, p. 195.
18. JDL, XI, p. 54.
19. No. VIII, line 21.
20. No. VI, line 3.
21. No. VII, line 10; No. IX, lines 9-10.
22. EI, IX, p. 269. See also ibid., IV, p. 197, n. 6.
23. See EI, XXXVII, p. 127.
24. Description of Mādhavavarman Śrīnivāsa in the Buguda plates (EI, III, p. 44, text lines 24-25) and the Puri plates (ibid., XXIII, p. 128, verse 9). See also CA, pp. 202-03.
25. JDL, XI, 53. The fire-pit origin is endorsed in EHAC, p. 201.
26. HSI, p. 121.
27. See Ganguli, *The History of the Paramara Dynasty*, pp. 1 ff.
28. The concerned passage reads : *Darśē cha pūrṇamāsē cha yasy=ēha haviṛ=uchyatē | Vishṇur=nām=ēha yō=gnis=tu Dhṛitimān =nāma sō=ṅgirāḥ* ‖ See MB., *Āraṇya*. Ch. 211, n. under verse 12). If the other and better reading *Vishṇunā saha* in the place of *Vishṇur=nām=ēha* is preferred, then the name 'Vishṇu' may not denote a fire-god at all.
29. See above Ch. I, sect, i.
30. EI, IV, p. 195. It is also remarked that *Vinukoṇḍa* may be a variant of *Vishṇukuṇḍa* or °*ṇḍi*. See also JDL, XI, p. 53; ED, p. 423.
31. QJMS, XXV, p. 75.
32. ED, pp. 424-25.
33. See the inscriptions of the Traikūṭakas (CII IV, p. 24, and p. 27 etc.).
34. See the Allahabad *Praśasti* of Samudragupta (CII, III, p. 6 ff., lines 19-20).
35. Though the epigraphical texts are often full of irregular and wrong forms, it would be improper to presume an irregularity in *Vishṇukuṇḍi*, occurring fifteen times, merely because the available form is against the theory of some authors course, the dynastic names like *Śākya, Audumbara*, etc., derived from the names of the trees *śaka, udumbara* etc., (see SS, p. 229), have *ādi-vṛiddhi*, while the dynastic name *Kadamba* does not have the same, though it comes from the name of the tree *kadamba* (CA, p. 270). But it should not be forgotten that while the former two names are used in the literary sense, the latter is used as what is called *aupachārika-prayōga* (*i e.* the use of the word not in the literary sense). That is why while Aśvaghōsha derives *Śākya* from *śaka* (*Saundaranandana*, canto, I, verse 24), the poet Kubja, the composer of the Talagunda inscription of the Kadamba Mṛigēśavarman characterises the name Kadamba as *upachāravat*. (See EI, VIII, p, 32, verse 8). The translator of this verse (ibid., p. 34) has missed this point. But in the present case there is no authority to assume that *Vishṇukuṇḍi* is also *upachāravat*.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

36. See Ch. IV, sect. ii. After some detailed analysis Dubreuil too has come, in his own way, to the conclusion that the Vishṇukuṇḍis crossed the Kṛishṇā c. 500 A.D. and occupied the region of Amarāvatī and further south. See JAHRS, V, pp. 91-92.
37. EI, IV, p. 195.
38. ED, pp. 423 ff.
39. See the *Kāśikā* and the *Siddhāntakaumudī* under Pāṇini's rules *Tadrājasya bahushu tēn=aiv=āstriyām* (II, iv, 62) and *Kambōjāl =luk* (IV, i, 175). Cf. also the rule *Janapada-śabdāt=kshatriyād=añ* (IV, i, 168).
40. Koṇḍapaḍumaṭidēśa is the same as the Giripaśchimadēśa.
41. See PA, II, iv, 62. Technically speaking *Raghūṇām* etc., are to be rendered as 'of the Raghus' and not 'of the descendants of Raghu'. See Nāgēśa's *Laghuśabdēndu-śēkhara* under the above rule.
42. LL, No. 1186; EI, XXXIV, pp. 239 ff; LL, No. 1195.
43. See below n. 54.
44. RC, pp. 253 and liii.
45. EI, XXXIV, p. 203, text line 3.
46. Ibid., p. 199.
47. RC, p. lxxxvi. *Muḍānanda* must be now taken in the sense of a scion of the Muṇḍa tribe or clan. For, one of the recently discovered Sannathi (Gulbarga District, Karnataka State) inscriptions refer to the *Muḍāṇa Mahāgāmi i.e.*, the *Mahāgrāmika* officer of the Muṇḍa tribe or clan. See ARE, 1966-67, No. B. 223.
48. RC, pp. lxxxvi ff.
49. For, this person figures along with others who are kings. Again *Sātakarṇī*, at the end of his name, is usually met with the names of the kings of Vanavāsa country to which he is also stated to belong in the said inscription.
50. D.R. Bhandarkar had opined that *Chuṭukulānanda* was a proper name or individual epithet. (*Lectures*, p. 33, n. 1). Probably taking a clue from this, an attempt has been recently made, to establish that *Chuṭukula* is the personal name of the king, on the anology of *Rājakulabhaṭṭa*, the name of a poet and that the former is the Sanskritised form of the Dravidian *Chuṭukaḍa* just as *Mihirakula* is of the Persian *Mihirgul* (EI, XXXV, p. 72). But, first of all there is scarcely any proof to indicate that *Chuṭukaḍa* is Dravidian. On the other hand, the word °*kaḍa* seems to correspond to the Skt. °*kaṭaka* (CII, II, pt. ii, p. 7) and we have got place-names like Dhaṁñakaḍa (LL, Nos. 1205, 1225, 1271), Dhēnukākaḍa (ibid., Nos. 1092-93 ff.) etc. Therefore it is better to treat Chuṭukaḍa as a place-name only (AIU, p. 208). Therefore the *Mihirgul—Mihirakula* analogy seems unsuitable to the context. In fact *Rājakula* of the expression *Rājakulabhaṭṭa* is properly an official designation (see S. Ins., p. 281, n.; JAIH, IV, pp. 214 ff.) and hence *Rājakulabhaṭṭa* may have to be taken in the sense of a 'a Brāhmaṇa holding the office of the *Rājakula*'. Therefore this example also may not be applicable to the present case. For the view that *Chuṭukula*, as stated by Rapson, is only a clanish name, see Prof. Mirashi, EI, XXXVII, p. 48. Above all, as we are going to see, an expression like *Chuṭukaḍa* is neither found nor intended in the inscriptions and coins of the Chuṭus. In this context it may also be borne in mind that the Nasik inscription of Puḷumāvi speaks of what is called *Sātavahanakula* (EI, VIII, p. 60, line 6), and no scholar has ventured to suggest that that expression represents a personal name Sanskritised from a supposed *Sadavāhanakaḍa*, even though D.R. Bhandarkar opined that the Sātavāhanas were of Dravidian origin (*Lectures*, p. 34, n.). For the writer's detailed discussion on the various theories in the field see JNSI, XXXIV, pp. 36 ff.
51. SED, s.v.
52. EC, VII, pp. 252-53, Nos. 263-64.
53. EI, VIII, pp. 31 ff., verse 33.
54. For, *kuṇḍa* is derived from the root *kuḍ*+ the suffix *ach* (PA, III, i, 134) and *kuṇḍi* from the same root *kuḍ*+the suffix *in* (*Uṇādi*, 557), both having the same meaning. However, Jayaswal equated *Viṇhukaḍḍa* to *Vishṇuskanda* (JBORS, XIX, p. 164).
55. EI, XXX, p. 266.
56. EI, XXIII, p. 139.
57. EI, I, p. 6, text line 19. The Prakrit form of this name *Khandakoṇḍi* is Sanskritised without doubt by Bühler as *Skandakoṇḍi* (ibid., p. 8) and we have actually *Vishṇukoṇḍi* in the Polamuru plates I. For the interchanging of *u* and *o*, cf. also *Polakēśi* of the Aihole *praśasti* and *Pulakēśi* of many other Chālukyan records.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

58. RC, p. lxxxiv.
59. See e.g. EI, XXXV, pp. 76 ff.
60. Scholars once believed that both the inscriptions belong to one and the same king (e.g. BG, p. 277; EI, VIII, p. 29; RC, liii ff.). Now, however, it is held that they belong to different kings (SS, pp. 222-30; AIU, p. 209).
61. RC, p. liii.
62. See EI, XXXVII, p. 30 and n. 7.
63. See LL, No. 124 b. Here *svārthika-pratyaya* is added to the name as in the case of *Chuṭuka* of the coins. See EI, XXXV, p. 76, Coins Nos. 4-5 etc. See No. VII, line 10 and note 6.
64. See CII, II, pt. ii, p. 7.
65. See Lüders' *Mathura Inscriptions*, p. 101.
66. See N. Dey's *Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval India*, 2nd. ed., s.v.
67. See CII, II, pt. ii, p. 7.
68. See Ch. 96, verse 148.
69. See EI, II, p. 371, inscription No. 133. Cf. LL, No. 188 and p. 175.
70. SED, s.v.
71. SS, p. 112, n. 2.
72. EI, XXXII, p. 86.
73. CII, V, p. 96, line 3.
74. RC, pp. lxxxiii ff., 59; EI, XXXV, pp. 75 ff.
75. RC, Plate V, Nos. 106 and 111; p 59 & n. 2. Unfortunately this Chuṭu coin has not been illustrated by Rapson. However he compares the symbol (*nāga* symbol according to him) on it with that on the Muṇḍa coin.
76. EI, XVII, p. 334.
77. SS, pp. 130-131.
78. RC, p. clxxvi, Nos. 8-9.
79. See G.M. Moraes, *The Kadambakula*, Bombay, 1931, plates between pp. 376 and 377. Dubreuil, who was not aware of the Ipur sets, had suggested a relationship between the Kadamba and the Vishṇukuṇḍi families on the basis of this lion crest. See AHD, p. 92. It may be remembered that the Kadambas were the successors of the Chuṭus in the Kuntala country.
80. See EI, XI, pp. 337-38 and plate facing p. 338.
81. See JNSI, XXVIII, 1966, pt. i, pp. 57-59 and pl. III, No. 2; APGMS, No. 2, pp. 30-31 and plate 2, Nos. 6, 7 and 8.
82. RC, pp. xxii, xliii.
83. JDL, XI, pp. 53-54.
84. ED, p. 423.
85. Cf. *Śūrāṇāñ=cha nadīnāñ=cha prabhavā durvidāḥ kila !*
MB, *Ādi*, Ch. 127, verse 11.
86. Cf. *Āchārya trividhā yōnī=rājñāṁ śāstra—viniśchayē ।*
tatkulīnaś=cha śūraś=cha sēnāṁ yaś=cha prakarshati ॥
ibid., Ch. 126, verse 34.
87. CHI, I, pp. 598 ff.
88. *Studies in the Society and Administration of Ancient and Medieval India*, Vol. I (Calcutta, 1967), pp. 121 ff.
89. JPASB (NS), V, pp. 186 ff; IA, XL, pp. 35 ff.
90. SEHI, p. 436.
91. VIJ, I, pp. 86 ff.; p. 320 f.
92. DKA, p. 38.
93. Taking into account the forms of the names Puḷumāvi and Chuṭukula, some have viewed the Sātavāhanas and the Chuṭus to be of Dravidian blood. (*Lectures*, p. 34 n.) But we have already seen the untenability of the theory that takes *Chuṭukula* for personal name. Again *Pulumāvi* is same as *Pulōmāvi* of the *Puraṇas* and might be a name of god Indra, *avi* meaning 'pain'. Cf. Indra's name *Pulomāri* (cf. also SED, s.v., *Pulōman*). Moreover, even if *Pulumāvi* is proved to be Dravidian, it may not decide the issue, as the majority of the Andhra kings bore Sanskritic names.
94. I.e. according to *Bhāga*, IX, Ch. 23, verse 1 ff.
95. I.e. according to *Hari*, I, Ch. 31 verse 1 ff. See below.
96. See *Bhāga*. IX, Ch. 23, verses 4-6. Also see *Hari*. I, Ch. 31, verses 33-35 and 39.
97. The origin of the Andhra dynasty has been dealt with by many scholars. See e.g. CHI, I, p. 599; AIU, pp. 192 ff; Com.HI, pp. 296 ff; EHD, pp. 73 ff.
98. Ai. B, XXXIV, v; Śa. B., III, ii, 1, 39-40. See also Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, *Spiritual Authority and Temporal Power in the Indian Theory of Government* (New Haven, 1942), p. 16.
99. *Manu*, VII, 14.
100. *Bhāga.*, IX, Ch. 20, verse 1.
101. Cf. *Brahmakshatrasya yō yōnir=vaṁśō dēvarshi-satkṛitaḥ । Vāyu*, (Ch. 99, verse 278); *Matsya*, (Ch. 50, verse 88). *Bhāga*, (IX, Ch. 23, verse 44) reads *Brahmakshatrasya vai prōktō vaṁśaḥ.*
102. Cf. *Sarvē Brāhmaṇatāṁ gatāḥ* (*Matsya*, Ch. 49, verse 40) and also *Kshatrōpēṭāḥ dvijātayaḥ* (*Vāyu*, Ch. 99, verses 161, 164; *Matsya*,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

(Ch. 49, verses 38, 41), all describing some of the members of the Puru family. See also below.

103. *Hari*, I, Ch. 31, verse 56. Cf. the commentary of Nīlakaṇṭha thereunder.

104. *Vāyu*, Ch. 99, verses 138 ff; *Matsya*, Ch. 49, verses 14 ff; *Hari*, I, Ch. 32, verses 13 ff; *Bhāga*, IX, Ch. 20, verses 35 ff; *Brahma.*, Ch. 13, verses 58 ff. etc.

105. Cf. *Tasmād=divyō Bharadvājō Brāhmaṇyāt= Kshatriyō=bhavat | Vāyu*, Ch. 99, verse 157.

106. Cf. *Tasmād=api Bharadvājāt Brāhmaṇāḥ Kshatriyā bhuvi |*
dvyāmushyāyaṇa-kaulīnāḥ smṛitās=tē dvividhēna cha ||
Matsya, Ch. 49, verses 33. The expression *dvividhēna cha* seems to indicate that some of the descendants were also known individually either as Brāhmaṇas or as Kshatriyas.

107. See Ch. III, iv, 7.

108. Cf. the commentary *Bhāṭṭachandrikā* thereunder. See above n. 102.

109. Cf. *Saptarshayō nṛipaiḥ sārdhaṁ santānārthaṁ yugē yugē | kshatrasy=aivaṁ samu chchhēdaḥ sambandhō vai dvijaiḥ smṛitaḥ || Vāyu*· Ch. 99, verse 444 etc.

110. See the king's Tiruvellarai (Tiruchirapalli District) Inscription (SII, XII, No. 48). It is really interesting to note that the Pahlavas, Andhras along with the Madras seem to be described as being born of the Brahmakshatra families (*Brahmakshatraprasūtāḥ*) in the *Śāntiparvan* of the *Mahābhārata* (Ch. 65, verses 13-14). The Southern Recension of the Epic reads *Pallava* instead of *Pahlava*. It is also equally interesting to find that the Pallavas claimed the *gōtra* of Bharadvāja and that the person with whom, according to the *Purāṇas*, the *Brahmakshatrakula* started was also one Bharadvāja.

111. Cf. *Brahmakshatramayīm śriyaṁ+++bibhrāṇena*, a description of Brahmādhirāja, a Brahmin minister of Nandivarman Pallavamalla (SII, II, pp. 350-51, lines 89-90); *Brāhmaṁ kshātraṁ=cha sat=tējō vapush= aiva babhāra yaḥ* a description of Vatsarāja (EI, XXXVII, p. 55, verse 4); *Brahmakshatrānvitaḥ*, an epithet of the Guhila king Bhartṛipaṭṭa (EI, XIII, p. 13, verse 7); *Sa Brahmakshatriyāṇām=ajani kula-śirō-dāma Sāmantasēnaḥ*, a description of Sāmantasēna(EI, I, p. 307, verse 5). Chāmuṇḍarāya, the minister of the Western Gaṅga Mārasimha II is stated to have been born in the Brahmakshatra race (EI, V, p. 171).

112. See DKA, p. 38, n. 2.

113. *Nāma*, II, ix, verse 1 and commentaries thereunder. SED, s.v. *vṛishala*.

114. Cf. *Śiśukō=ndhraḥ sa-jātīyaḥ* (DKA, p. 38). The rendering of the expression *sa-jātīyaḥ* as 'with his fellow tribesmen' does not appear to convey the intended meaning. The text here is rather corrupt. The context as well as an analysis of all the available varied readings of the passage seems to suggest the intended reading as *Kāṇvāyaṇaṁ tatō bhṛityaḥ Suśarmāṇaṁ prsahya tam | Śuṅgānāṁ ch=aiva yach=chhēshaṁ kshapayitvā balīyasām | Śiśukō=ndhraḥ sa-jātīyaḥ prāpsyat=īmāṁ vasundharām.*

115. IV, ii, 3.

116. See, Br.S, I, iii, 34 and the commentaries of Śrī-Śaṅkara etc. thereunder. Another example in the historical period is this; Pushyamitra Śuṅga killed the last Maurya king Bṛihadratha and hence Bāṇabhaṭṭa characterises him as *an-ārya* (*Harsha*, Ch. VI, p. 269). Nobody has suggested, on that account, that the Śuṅga belonged to the non-Āryan race. All take the word *an-ārya* in the sense of 'wicked', or 'base born'.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CHAPTER III

THE RISE OF THE VISHṆUKUṆḌI POWER

THE rise of the Vishṇukuṇḍi power, just as the rise of many other powers of ancient India, is a mystery. But it can be comprehended to some extent by understanding what geographical unit served as the nucleus of the early activities of the Vishṇukuṇḍis and what historical processes might have helped their rise.

(i) THE NUCLEUS

The Vēṅgī country was the centre of the Vishṇukuṇḍi power at its height. But it does not appear to be the earliest stage of their political activities. In the last chapter we saw that the Vishṇukuṇḍi kings originally belonged to the Śrīśailam hills. Therefore one should naturally look for the activities of the early members of the dynasty in a place round about that area only. The region on the southern and western sides of the said hills, *viz.*, the modern Kurnool-Bellary-Raichur region formed parts of the Pallava and Kadamba dominions in the 4th and 5th centuries A.D.[1] The region on the eastern side of the Śrīśailam hills, *i.e.*, Guntur District was under the sway of the Ānandas and then it passed on into the hands of the Pallavas[2] from whom it was taken to the Vishṇukuṇḍi dominions only subsequently by Mādhavavarman II, as we shall see in the next chapter. Consequently the centre of the activities of the early rulers of the dynasty is to be located in the territory on the northern side of the Śrīśailam, *viz.*, the modern Mahbubnagar-Nalgoṇḍa region. This suggestion seems to receive support from the Tummalagudem (Nalgoṇḍa District) set I of an early king[3] of the dynasty. It speaks of a *vihāra* built there by his queen. It was this Mahbubnagar-Nalgoṇḍa region, *i.e.*, the middle valley of the river Kṛishṇā where Prof. H.C. Rayachaudhuri,[4] Dr. Sircar,[5] etc., locate the Ṛishika country.

According to some other scholars the Ṛishika country was identical with the modern Khāndesh.[6] But[7] in the Nasik inscription of Puḷumāvi, Ṛishika (=Prākṛit Asika) is mentioned along with Aśmaka (=Prākṛit Asaka);[8] and in the *Mārkaṇḍēya Purāṇa* this country is clubbed with the countries of Kuntala and Andhra in the list of the southern *dēśas*.[9] Further, it is also mentioned immediately before Kuntala by Varāhamihira in his *Bṛihatsaṁhitā*.[10] All these may suggest that the Ṛishika country was contiguous to the Kuntala, Andhra and Aśmaka countries. Kuntala and Andhra respectively comprised the upper and lower valleys of the Kṛishṇā,[11] while the Aśmaka proper was the northern part of the old Hyderabad State.[12] Therefore, Ṛishika is to be identified, as many scholars have done,[13] with the southern part of the Telengana in the middle valley of the Kṛishṇā, *i.e.*, the Mahbubnagar-Nalgoṇḍa region, which is contiguous to the said three countries.[14]

Again, a country called Ākara is mentioned by Varāhamihira in the list of the southern *janapadas*, which includes also Ṛishika and Kuntala as we saw earlier.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Similarly, in the Nāsik list of territories of Gautamīputra Śrī Sātakarṇi, both Ṛishika and Ākara find mention.[15] While translating the *Bṛihatsaṁhitā*, Prof. Kern[16] has identified Ākara with the modern Khāndesh. Other scholars too hold the same view.[17] If this identification is accepted, then the lists given by Varāhamihira and by the Nasik inscription in which the two countries, *viz.*, Khāndesh (*i.e.* Ākara) as well as Ṛishika figure, may indicate that they are different and not identical.

No doubt, the above suggestion goes counter to the theory according to which Ākara is identical with the Eastern Malwa, having its capital at Vidiśā.[18] But, Kālidāsa refers to that country, *i.e.*, Eastern Malwa by the name Daśārṇa.[19] To say that Daśārṇa and Ākara were the two names of the Eastern Malwa country[20] would be to ignore altogether the testimony of the ancient writers like Varāhamihira, Parāśara, etc. For, they include Daśārṇa in the list of the south-eastern countries,[21] and Ākara alongwith the Vēṇā and Avantī in the list of the southern countries.[22] Furthermore, the Junagadh inscription of Rudradāman I, gives a list of countries included in the empire of that *Mahākshatrapa*.[23] There the list begins with the expression *Pūrv-Āpar-Ākar-Āvanty-Anūpa*.[24] Now, if the names Ākara and Avantī could themselves denote respectively the East and West Malwas, as believed by Rapson[25] and others,[26] why then the unnecessary adjective *pūrv-āpara* ? On the other hand, if, *Ākara* means 'Khāndesh', as we have stated above, then the said adjective serves a good purpose. As in the case of Malwa so in the case of the adjacent Khāndesh too, the territory seems to have been divided into the eastern and western halves on one reason or the other.[27] As a matter of fact while *pūrv-āpara* is to qualify necessarily the immediately following *Ākara* of the compound, it may remain as *kṛita-kṛitya* by qualifying *Ākara* alone.[28] There is practically no reason why it should be taken to qualify *Avantī* too. Or else, why should it not be taken further to qualify *Anūpa* etc. also of the compound ? Besides the rules of grammar may not permit one to construe in the compound *Pūrva* (eastern) with Ākara and *apara* (western) with *Avantī*, as has been usually done by the modern scholars.[29]

In fact the evidences of Vātsyāyana, Kālidāsa, Varāhamihira, Bāṇabhaṭṭa, Vātsyāyana's commentator Yaśōdhara etc.,[30] clearly indicate that in ancient times the eastern part of the modern Malwa was known by the name Daśārṇa or Mālava while the western part by the name Avantī; and that in some later period only the whole territory came to be viewed as a single unit under the name Malava. Therefore to hold *Pūrvāparākarāvantī* of Rudradāman's inscription as indicative of the eastern and western parts of a single geographical unit, *viz.*, modern Malwa is to set aside all these points. At any rate, on the basis of the above discussion one may be right in concluding that Ākara was different from Daśārṇa or Eastern Mālwa and it is also very probably identical with Khāndesh[31] which was therefore different from Ṛishika. Thus, it is certain that the last mentioned country included the Mahbubnagar-Nalgoṇḍa region and it formed the earlier stage of the rulers of the Vishṇukuṇḍi dynasty.

(ii) EARLY HISTORY OF ṚISHIKA

The edicts of Aśōka at Maski, Gavīmaṭh and Pālkiguṇḍu, all in the Raichur District and those at Erṛaguḍi in the Kurnool District, suggest that Ṛishika was well within the empire of Aśōka. Probably it was annexed to the Mauryan empire earlier by Chandragupta Maurya himself.[32] After the fall of the Mauryas, the country

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

passed on to the Sātavāhanas. There was in this country a city, perhaps an important one, on the bank of, or not far removed from the Kṛishṇā river. The Chēdi ruler Khāravēla of Kaliṅga (about the 2nd or the 1st century B.C.),[33] in his Hathigumpha inscription, calls this city by the name Ṛishikanagara and claims to have threatened it in his second regnal year, by despatching a huge army, disregarding Sātakarṇi, (*i.e.*, a Sātavāhana ruler) of the west.[34] The language of the inscription does not indicate that the Chēdi ruler conquered or occupied the country. So, even after his raid, Ṛishika seems to have continued to be under the Sātavāhanas. It is found included in the list of countries, of which Gautamiputra Śrī Sātakarṇi (1st or 2nd century A.D.)[35] claims to be the lord.[36]

A large number of Sātavāhana coins[37] also, lately unearthed in this area, testify that the country remained under the effective control of the Sātavāhanas down to the time of Yajña Śrī Sātakarṇi. We have, in the last chapter, referred to the coins of the Chuṭu and Śivala chiefs that have come to light from this area. We have also alluded to the relationship that existed between these families. It seems that the area passed on to them round about 200 A.D., when the Sātavāhana empire was fast declining, after Yajña Śrī Sātakarṇi. It is however difficult to be certain whether the Chuṭus and the Śivalas ruled over the area one after another or both simultaneously held sway over parts of the country. It may be remarked that some chiefs of the Chuṭukula enjoyed the designation of *Maharaṭhi*[38] while some others of the family had that of *Mahāsēnāpati*.[39] Therefore it is not unlikely that atleast some of the Koṇḍāpur (near Hyderabad) coins bearing the legend *Maharaṭhi*[40] were issued by the Chuṭukula chiefs.[41]

The complete legend, preserved only in a few of the Chuṭukula coins of the area, runs *Mahāsēnāpatisa Bharadajiputasa Sagamāna-Chuṭukulasa*.[42] There is a long controversy regarding the interpretation of this legend. Without entering into any argument we may safely follow the method by which we understood in the last chapter the expressions like *Vishṇurudra-Śivalānanda* and *Viṇhukaḍa Chuṭukulānanda*. There we saw that the respective first parts of those expressions, *viz.*, *Vishṇurudra* and *Viṇhukaḍa* were personal names while *Śivala* and *Chuṭukula* were clanish names.[43] So one may not be wrong in concluding that the above mentioned coin-legend also is of a king named Sagamāna who belonged to the Chuṭu family and who was the son of a woman of the Bhāradvāja *gōtra*, and had the designation *Mahāsēnāpati*. Sagamāna (=Skt. Svargamāna or Saṅgamāna)[44] may well make a personal name like Vardhamāna, Koṇḍamāna,[45] Pātamāna[46] etc. Thus these coins indicate that the Chuṭukula king by name Sagamāna was ruling over Ṛishika, owing nominal allegiance evidently to a Sātavāhana overlord.

How long the Śrīparvatīya Andhras, *viz.*, Sagamāna and his descendants ruled in this area in that capacity we do not know. It is possible that they declared total independence before long because the imperial power of the Sātavāhanas was becoming rapidly weaker and weaker. Even the last vestige of the once great Sātavāhana empire had disappeared sometime in the first half of the third century.[47] Whether the coins of other families like those of the Śivalas[48] from this area signify a struggle for supremacy among the members of the different families is more than what can be affirmed with the material now available. However, it may be recalled that

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

according to the *Purāṇas* there were seven Śrīparvatīya Andhra kings who ruled, on the whole, for 52 or 112 years[49] (*i.e.*, on an average of less than 8 or exactly 16 years each). We are not aware of seven Chuṭu kings. It is also not known whether the Purāṇic number 'seven' of the Śrīparvatīyas probably includes, besides the Chuṭukulas, their kinsmen also, *i.e.*, the chiefs of the Śivala family. At any rate, it may not be wrong to say that there was constant strife among them for predominance, resulting in the short reign period for each ruler, as mentioned above. Again it may be provisionally suggested that the independent rule of the Śrīparvatīya Andhras that began perhaps round about the beginning of the third century A.D. might have ended, as the *Purāṇas* tell us, after 112 years, *i.e.*, more or less about the beginning of the next century.

Sometime during the period under question the Śrīparvatīya Andhras seem to have branched off into two distinctive groups, one ruling over the country of Vanavāsa and the other sticking on to the homeland, *viz.*, the Śrīparvata and Ṛishika. To the former group belonged the kings Viṇhukaḍa Chuṭukulānandas of the Banavāsi and Malavalli records.[50] Perhaps the Vanavāsaka Mahārāja, to whom was married the Ikshvāku princess Koḍabalisiri, a sister of Chantamula II,[51] was a member of this branch. To the other group perhaps belonged Sagamāna and others of the Koṇḍāpur coins referred to above. Now, about 300 A.D. the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasēna I (c. 275-335 A.D.)[52] was seriously engaged in his warlike career and was annexing, one after another, to his dominions the petty kingdoms that had sprung out of the defunct Sātāvāhana empire. He is credited with the title *saṁrāṭ* and is stated to have conducted extensive conquests and to have performed several sacrifices including four *Aśvamēdhas*.[53] His kingdom is known to have extended into far south and to have included the northern districts of the former Hyderabad State.[54] It would not have been difficult at all for an ambitious and mighty conqueror of the calibre of Pravarasēna I to march a little further southward and to annex to his dominions the Ṛishika country also, by putting down there the rulers of the area who, at that time due to their mutual long wars, must have been too much exhausted to organise an effective resistance to the invader.

In this connection it may be useful to bear in mind some facts. On the ground of some common phraseology found only in the early charters of the Vākāṭakas and the Pallavas, it has been suggested that there must have been some connection between the Vākāṭakas and the Pallavas.[55] The above feature perhaps shows that the territories of both the powers were contiguous to one another. Besides, the early Pallava ruler Skandaśishya, is praised to have captured a *ghaṭikā* of the Brāhmaṇas from a king called Satyasēna.[56] This Satyasēna remains yet to be identified satisfactorily.[57] There was one Satyasēna who is considered to be the author of the verses 233 and 298 of the famous *Gāthāsaptaśatī*. It has been conjectured that Satyasēna might have been a Vākāṭaka.[58] If that is accepted, one may also identify the Pallava's opponent Satyasēna too with the same Vākāṭaka. This again would lead one to suppose that the territories of the Vākāṭaka and the Pallava were contiguous to one another ; that both these kings were hostile to one another ; and that the Pallava captured the *ghaṭikā* from the Vākāṭaka during a raid into the land of the latter. But there is no evidence to show that the Pallava dominion during the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

period in question had ever extended beyond the Kṛishṇā in the north.[59] On the other hand the Amaravati inscription, referred to earlier, suggests that the Vākāṭaka family was not completely new to the Andhra country.[60] Moreover the *Śrīśaila-māhātmya* which we will examine later in detail goes to indicate that the Vākāṭaka might have penetrated southward into the Ṛishika country as far as the Kṛishṇā.

At any rate, leaving a more satisfactory answer to the question of the southern boundary of the Vākāṭaka dominions to the future discoveries and researches, one may, on the reasons shown above, believe that Ṛishika was at least within the sphere of the influence of the Vākāṭakas even if it was not under their direct control;[61] and that the rulers of the country were probably vassals of the Vākāṭaka monarchs. This suggestion seems to find support from *Āchārya* Daṇḍin who, in the *Viśrutacharita* of his well-known romance *Daśakumāracharita*,[62] includes the king of Ṛishika also in the list of the feudatories of a Vidarbha king, presumably a Vākāṭaka king of the period under question. After Pravarasēna I, the Vākāṭaka empire was divided. Vindhyaśakti II of the Vatsagulma line was a ruler of an extensive kingdom and it is his Basim record that bears a close resemblance to the Prākṛit charters of the Pallavas,[63] as pointed out earlier. So it is likely that the rulers of Ṛishika became the vassals of the Vākāṭaka rulers of the Vatsagulma branch.

In spite of their vassalage, the rulers of the Śrīparvata and its adjacent northern territory, *viz.*, Ṛishika seem to have played an important political role. It was during this period that the Kadamba Mayūraśarman established his power in Banavāsi. By way of elucidating the circumstances that led to his rise, the Talagunda inscription of his great-grandson informs us how that Brāhmaṇa, being exasperated with the Kshatra (*i.e.*, the Pallava) at Kāñchī, vanquished the latter's frontier-guard, and occupied the impregnable forest area in the pass leading to the Śrīparvata,[64] and managed to extract levies from the feudatories of the Pallava including Bṛihad-Bāṇa; and how the Pallava, having realised that it was impossible, even with his own huge army, to vanquish the Kadamba in the battles, chose him for a friend and made him the ruler of the west, *viz.*, the kingdom of Banavāsi.[65] The fact that Mayūraśarman, though an upstart, proved to be quite a formidable foe even to the very powerful Pallava in the Śrīparvata region betrays that he had had the backing of the Śrīparvatīya chiefs, probably the Chuṭukulas or the early Vishṇukuṇḍis. The fact that by a treaty with the Pallava, Mayūraśarman managed to get the rulership of the Banavāsi kingdom over which the Chuṭus had been ruling till then, seems to add some strength to this suggestion. Dubreuil had already remarked that the common lion-crest of the Kadambas and the Vishṇukuṇḍis proves some kind of family relationship between them.[66] Maybe, during the period of Mayūraśarman's occupation of the *Śrīparvata-dvāra* area, a family relationship was effected perhaps by a marriage between the two houses.

(iii) EARLY VISHṆUKUṆḌI RULERS

The Vishṇukuṇḍi epigraphs do not help us in understanding how the dynasty came to prominence. The only information they supply is that the Vishṇukuṇḍis rose to power by their own efforts,[67] and that they were helped in this respect by the grace of the god Śrīparvatasvāmin.[68] This is too vague a statement to be made use of in drawing a clear picture. Therefore one has to depend entirely on the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

circumstantial evidences supplied by the history of the region, traced in the last section. It has been seen that the early rulers of Ṛishika might have been feudatories under the Vākāṭaka rulers of the Vatsagulma branch. It is likely that during the period of their vassalage, *i.e.*, sometime about 300 A.D., there arose amongst them a powerful chief who crushed the other petty chieftains of the area by his own valour, consolidated his conquest and founded his own dynasty. It has been concluded earlier that *Vishṇukuṇḍi* was a name of an individual whose descent the Vishṇukuṇḍi rulers claimed. Therefore one may provisionally take that individual, named Vishṇukuṇḍi, as a historical personage and identify him with the founder of the dynasty (*gōtra*). This Vishṇukuṇḍi is characterised as a devotee of the god of the Śrīparvata.[69] There is no clue to determine the exact date of this chief. Nor can one say anything definitely about his activities.

From the Tummalagudem set I we learn that in the family of the Vishṇukuṇḍis was born the *Mahārāja* Indravarman and that his son was *Mahārāja* Mādhavavarman. This record, the only source of our information regarding these two kings, does not mention anything beyond their names and titles. Consequently no information is available about their exact political status and the area they were ruling over. It is, however, likely that they were powerful enough to assume the title *Mahārāja*. In the Tummalagudem sets I and II there figures a city called Indrapura. The queen of Gōvindavarman I, the grandson of Indravarman I, is said to have built a Buddhist monastery there.[70] This city was possibly founded by, and named after, this *Mahārāja* Indravarman I. Maybe, it was the capital of the dynasty during the early period.[71] It has been identified with the area of the modern Indrapālaguṭṭa near Tummalaguḍem in the Ramannapeta Taluk in the Nalgonda District.

The reigns of *Mahārāja* Indravarman I and his son *Mahārāja* Mādhavavarman may roughly be assigned to a period comprising the last quarter of the fourth century A.D., and the first quarter of the fifth century A.D. As the Sālaṅkāyanas are known to have been ruling over the eastern part of the Andhra Pradesh during this period,[72] the political activities of these two Vishṇukuṇḍi kings must have been confined to the western part of Andhra consisting of the Nalgonda District and possibly also the territory further west, *viz.*, the Mahbubnagar District.

The same period saw a notable turning point in the Vākāṭaka-Vishṇukuṇḍi relationship. While after the death of Vindhyaśakti II, the Vatsagulma branch of the Vākāṭakas was perhaps losing in strength, the main branch was maintaining or even gaining power and influence. Some scholars have already suggested that the members of the main branch might have helped the rulers of the other branch in the administration and that the two governments may have been amalgamated for a while, during the time of Pravarsēna II.[73] In any case, during the period under question, the influence of the rulers of the main line of the Vākāṭakas seems to have started penetrating into the Vishṇukuṇḍi territory which, as we already saw, had been till then within the sphere of influence of the rulers of the Vatsagulma line.

The above fact seems to be indicated by the tradition recorded in the *Śrīśailasthlamāhātmya*, which informs us that one Chandrāvatī, a daughter of the king Chandragupta offered garlands of jasmine flowers daily to god Mallikārjuna at Śrīśailam.[74] Scholars are generally inclined to identify the said Chandrāvatī with

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Prabhāvatīguptā, who was the queen of the Vākāṭaka Rudrasēna II of the main line and was a daughter of the Gupta emperor Chandragupta II.[75] Just like a princess of Rudrasēna's family was known by the name Rudrabhaṭṭārikā, it is likely that Prabhāvatī, being a daughter of Chandragupta, was probably known also by the name Chandrāvatī.[76]

The above identification has been questioned and the historical value of the tradition has been denied by some on the ground that as the Vākāṭaka capital was far off from the Śrīśailam, the queen could not have supplied the garland everyday;[77] and that Prabhāvatī who claims to be a staunch worshipper of Vishṇu, the *bhagavat* (*atyanta-bhagavad-bhaktā*) could not have worshipped the god Śiva-Mallikārjuna.[78] Of course, the traditions, though born from hard facts, often, by the passage of time, accumulate a lot of fiction around themselves. But to discard their evidence altogether on that account may not be justifiable. In any way, they wished to tell the truth atleast to begin with. The fact indicated by the said tradition seems to be that the Vākāṭaka queen made arrangements, evidently by means of some gifts, for supplying jasmine flower garlands to the deity daily. Prabhāvatī's brother Kumāragupta, though a staunch Vaishṇava (*Paramabhāgavata*)[79] gave much prominence to the Śaiva god Svāmi-Mahāsēna (*i.e.* Skanda—Kārttikēya).[80] Prabhāvatī's son Pravarasēna II and the poet Kālidāsa were Śaivas. Yet they wrote respectively the *Sētubandha* and the *Raghuvaṁśa*, the themes of which are mainly Vaishṇava.[81] Therefore the said tradition may well be taken on the whole as an indication to the fact that the Śrīśailam temple had been favoured by Prabhāvatī.[82] It also appears to indicate the queen's policy to replace the declining influence of the Vatsagulma house by extending the political influence of her own house in the Vishṇukuṇḍi area. Evidently her's was a friendly policy that culminated, as we shall subsequently see in a marriage tie between her house and the house of the Vishṇuku ṇḍis.[83]

(iv) GŌVINDAVARMAN I

As has been shown above, the reign of Mādhavarman I probably came to an end about 422 A.D. He was succeeded by his son Gōvindavarman I. The Tummalagudem set I is the only record of the latter we have. Before studying the contents of this charter, it is worthwhile to note the following interesting features of it.

(i) In the early charters of the family, *viz.*, those of Mādhavavarman II, Mādhavavarman III and Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, the texts are invariably precise and short and do not run to more than 14 or 16 lines which are distributed over four sides (*viz.*, the inner sides of the two outer plates and both the sides of the middle plate) of a set of three copper plates. A longer text running to more than 30 or 40 lines, distributed over more number of plates, seems to have become the fashion of the day from the time of Vikramēndravarman II. To this latter category belongs the Tummalagudem set I.

(ii) A comparative study of the characters of the grants of the family would reveal that the charter under question may have to be placed after the Ipur and Ramatirtham plates and that it cannot be far removed from the Chikkulla and Tummalagudem (II) plates in point of time.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

(iii) Again, the texts of the early charters of the family, *viz.*, Ipur (I and II) and Velpuru records, though written in Sanskrit, exhibit influence of Prākṛit which is totally absent in the present charter as in the case of the grants of the succeeding kings of the dynasty.

(iv) Similarly the texts of all the charters of the family are in the form of orders of the respective kings addressed to the residents etc., of the respective grant villages informing them of the royal gifts.[84] But the text of the present grant consists of a simple statement that some two villages were gifted by the king in favour of the *Āryasaṅgha*.

(v) Besides, the chain of privileges attached to the gift villages in the charter under discussion is conspicuously long and is nowhere else met with in the Vishṇukuṇḍi charters.

(vi) Unlike the other early charters of the family, the present grant does not refer to the officer *ājñā* or *ājñapti*,[85] and this peculiarity is also found in the Chikkulla plates of Vikramēndravarman II, and not in any other grants.

(vii) Moreover, the benedictory verse at the end of the present charter praying for the permanence of the Vishṇukuṇḍi rule is rather unusual and a similar instance is not met with elsewhere in the Vishṇukuṇḍi records. This verse reminds us of a similar one found at the end of the Godavari plates set II of Pṛithivīmūla, who, as we shall see later, was a contemporary of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman and his son.[86]

These unusual features of this charter of the earlier king of the family are likely to suggest that the record under question may not be a genuine one.[87] However, taking into consideration the palaeography as well as the contents of the record, that are corroborated by the Tummalagudem set II, we may conclude that the charter under question, *viz.*, Tummalagudem set I had been probably prepared during the time of Vikramēndravarman II,[88] the issuer of the second set from Tummalagudem, as the original charter had fallen into disuse; and that the present text had been composed by the Buddhist monks of the Paramamahādēvī-vihāra of Indrapura, most probably basing on an earlier text.[89] This suggestion may get some support from (1) the unusually long chain of epithets of Gōvindavarman running to nearly 10 lines; (2) the total absence of any reference to the Śrīparvatasvāmin, the god of the king's family, but at the same time too much of stress on the king's leaning towards the Buddhist religion ; and (3) the glorification of the Buddha and the Buddhist clergy, and the excessive use of the Buddhist technical terms in that context.

Above all, the declaration *sthitir-ēshā sthāpitā* towards the end of the formal portion of the record is significant as it seems to indicate the restoration of some original decree.[90] So it may be justifiably concluded that the text of the Tummalagudem set I was composed most probably adapting an earlier version of a record issued by Gōvindavarman I in his own (*ātmanaḥ*) 37th regnal year.[91]

Regarding the contents of this charter the following may be observed. This record is Buddhist in nature. It introduces the *Mahārāja* Gōvindavarman as a member of the family of the Vishṇukuṇḍis who were noted for their ability in protecting their subjects, and as the grandson of *Mahārāja* Indravarman and the son of *Mahārāja* Mādhavavarman. It endows Gōvindavarman with a long chain of epithets, many of them stressing the Buddhist leaning of the king.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

In further records the royal gift of two villages called Ērmadāla and Prēṇkapara in favour of the Buddhist *saṅgha* of the *vihāra* that had been built at Indrapura by his chief queen Paramamahādēvī. The record is dated in the full-moon day of the month Vaiśākha in Gōvindavarman's own 37th regnal year. The king must have chosen that day for a grant to the Buddhist *vihāra*, because both the festivals of the *jayantī* (birth) and the *parinirvāṇa* (death) of the Buddha fall on the Vaiśākhī-Pūrṇimā day. It has been shown already that the place Indrapura where the Buddha *vihāra* was built is to be identified with the area of Indrapālaguṭṭa near Tummalaguḍem, the findspot of the charter, about five miles from Rāmanapēṭa (17° 15′ N., 79° 15′ E.). Therefore the above-mentioned gift village too may respectively be identified with the modern Yeṟṟabaliguḍa (17° 35′ N. 79° 40′ E.) and with Paṅkabaṇḍa (17° 25′ N. 79° 10′ E.) or with Paṅkēra (17° 45′ N. 79° 45′ E.).

Apart from the above charter, the Velpuru and Ipuru (I) records of Mādhavavarman II and the Tummalagudem set II of Vikramēndravarman II also tell us something about Gōvidavarman I.

Gōvindavarman I started his reign sometime in the twenties of the fifth century A.D., *i.e.*, a period when the Vākāṭaka Pravarasēna II of the main line began ruling independently. We have already referred to the favourable policy pursued by the members of the main line of the Vākāṭakas towards the Vishṇukuṇḍis during this period. Gōvindavarman I might have taken full advantage of the backing extended by Pravarasēna II and of the weakness of the Vatsagulma line to aggrandize his position. He used his skill, might and energy and carved out a sizeable kingdom of his own[92] and ruled over it either independently or semi-independently. He seems to have also followed a policy of expansion by conducting aggressive wars into the territories of the neighbouring chiefs.[93] In the coastal Andhra country the power of the Sālaṅkāyanas was fast declining. This must have considerably helped Gōvindavarman in extending the boundaries of his kingdom. It is likely that by his warlike activities he managed to bring under him a group of the neighbouring feudal families.[94] To this group probably belonged the family of a chief named Pṛithivīmūla,[95] who was, as we shall see later, perhaps a fore father of his namesake who issued the Godavari plates, sets I and II. In the subsequent period this family is known to have had its seat somewhere in the western part of the East Godavari District.[96] In case it had had its hold over the same area even during the period under question, it may be believed that Gōvindavarman must have extended his kingdom considerably eastwards. There is nothing to support the view that Gōvindavarman was the ruler of the Trikūṭa and Malaya.[97]

Gōvindavarman's chief queen was Paramamahādēvī, also referred to as Paramabhaṭṭārikāmahādēvī,[98] to whom was born Mādhavavarman II. She is stated to be the daughter of Pṛithivīmūla mentioned above. It is likely that this matrimonial connection strengthened the position of the Vishṇukuṇḍi overlord.[99] The fact that the above Paramamahādēvī is referred to as the *agramahishī* or the chief queen, seems to suggest that Gōvindavarman I might have had more than one queen.

Gōvindavarman was not only a conqueror but also a righteous ruler and was a great builder. He is characterised as *paramadhārmika* or highly righteous.[100] He is said to have had a good mastery over all the religious or scientific treatises.[101] He

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

respected the *varṇāśramadharma*,[102] donated liberally to the Buddhist monks, the Brāhmaṇas, the helpless, etc.; and often gifted away villages, cultivable lands, gold, etc.[103] He is credited with the construction of beautiful temples, monasteries, halls, water-houses, etc., afresh, and with the act of repairing of the old ones.[104] These claims are not of political nature. Yet we may legitimately conclude that it was Gōvindavarman I under whom the family became powerful and began to rise to eminence, and that it was he, who, for all practical purposes, was the real founder of the dynasty. That is perhaps the reason why often the official genealogical accounts of the family in the subsequent ages, start from this monarch only. His achievements must have been considerable enough to tempt the Vākāṭaka ruler of the time to enter into a matrimonial relationship with the Vishṇukuṇḍi king. His success was so great as to be remembered as late as the time of his great-great grandson in whose record the fame of this king is described to outshine that of all his predecessors and successors of the family *(purv-āpara-kshitipati)*[105] and his virtues and wealth are compared to those of Gōvinda (*i.e.* Kṛishṇa-Vishṇu) himself. These details would suffice to show that there is hardly any basis for the conjecture that a Vākāṭaka ruler conquered the Sālaṅkāyana territory and handed over the same to the Vishṇukuṇḍi.[106] Besides, no Vākāṭaka king claims for himself such a munificient action. Again, to characterise Harishēṇa (c. 475—510 A.D.) as the bestower of the Andhra kingdom on Gōvindavarman[107] may not also fit in well in the Vishṇukuṇḍi chronology we are following here.

The records do not agree with one another in describing Gōvindavarman's religion. His Tummalagudem set I would give us an impression that he was a staunch Buddhist,[108] while his son Mādhavavarman's Ipur set I calls him a *Śrīparvatasvāmipādānudhyāta*.[109] It is probable that to begin with, he was a Buddhist and was subsequently converted to Śaivism just as the Pallava king Mahēndravarman I of the subsequent age, who, originally a Jaina, was converted to Śaivism.[110] If this is true, then it may be suggested that this change of religion of Gōvindavarman might have been due to his close contacts with the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasēna II, a *Paramamāhēśvara*,[111] whose mother, as we have already seen, favoured the temple of the god of Śrīśailam. In this context Longhurst's contention that the present Śiva temple at Śrīśailam "seems to have been a Buddhist site originally",[112] deserves one's attention.

However it may be remembered that the Tummalagudem charter I, is an adapted copy of an earlier record. Hence, the testimony of the Velpuru and Ipur records, which are nearer to Gōvindavarman's time, may carry greater weight than that of the Tummalagudem plates. Therefore one may doubt whether the Buddhist authors of the texts of both the sets of the Tummalagudem plates, tried in their enthusiasm to admire their patron Gōvindavarman, to portray him as a Buddhist. This doubt seems to draw some strength from the fact that unlike all the other records of the family, the Buddhist record, Tummalagudem set II alone calls Vikramēndravarman I a *Paramasaugata* or a devout follower of the religion of the Buddha. So it would appear that one may have to take only with a grain of salt, the description of Gōvindavarman's religion in the two sets of plates from Tummalagudem.[113]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. See. CA, pp. 271, 276.
2. Ibid., pp. 202 ff; EHAC, pp. 189 ff.
3. See below sect. iv.
4. EHD, pp. 26-27.
5. *S. Ins.* p. 206, n.
6. CII, V, pp. 123-24.
7. Dr. Sircar has already dealt with this question in detail and has established the above identification (SG, pp. 158 ff.) Therefore only a few new points in support of the theory are added here.
8. I.e. *Asika-Asaka+++ Ākar-Āvanti-rājasa* (EI, VIII, p. 60, text line 2).
9. I.e. *Nai (Ri) shikāḥ Kuntalā Andhrāḥ.* See SG,, p. 31.
10. *Samantri(Sahātriy-Ṛi)shikāḥ l Kuntala-Kērala*, etc. Ch. 16, verse ll. See also Prof. Kern's note on the passage (*Verspreide Geschriften*, eerste deel, p. 241, n. 3).
11. See Mirashi, EI, XXXVII, p. 18; H.C. Rayachaudhuri (op. cit.) p. 27.
12. SG. p. I54. For the other view see EI, XXXVII, p. 18.
13. See for example EHD., pp. 26-27; SG. p. 158.
14. Of course, at times Ṛishika is found coupled with Vidarbha also (CII, V, p. 123) which also seems to indicate that both were contiguous. But there the names Vidarbha seems to have been used in its wider sense 'empire of the Vidarbha kings'. Aśmaka formed part of the empire of the Vākāṭakas who ruled from Vatsagulma located by Rājaśēkhara in Vidarbha (EI, XXXVII, p. 18 and n. 7; SG, p. 158). A parellel example may be found in the name of Kuntala often used in its widest sense "the empire of the kings of Kalyāṇi". See EHD, p. 43.
15. See above note 8.
16. Op. cit., p. 235.
17. See SED, s.v.; PSED, s.v.
18. RC, p. xxxiii, etc.
19. *Mēgha.* I, verse 23.
20. See e.g., *S. Ins.*, p. 88, n. 2, p. 178, n. 4.
21. See *Bṛih.*, Ch. 14, verse 10 and Utpala-bhaṭṭa's commentary thereunder for quotations from Parāśara.
22. Ibid., verse 12. The correct reading of the passage is *Ākara-Vēṇ-Āvantika* as in Prof. Kern's copy (op. cit., p. 235). See JAIH, IV, p. 163.
23. See EI, VIII, p. 44, text line 11.
24. The usual rendering of the expression as "eastern and western Ākarāvanti" violates grammar. See below.
25. RC, p. cxix.
26. *S. Ins.*, p. 178, n. 4.
27. Prof. Mirashi is of the opinion that two branches of the royal house of *Mahārāja* Svāmirāja (c. 316-68 A. D.) were ruling over two parts of Khāndesh (CII, IV, p. xxxvi).
28. I.e. by a *Tatpurusha* compound as *Ākarasya pūrvāparau, Pūrvāpar-Ākarau* according to the rule *Pūrvāpara* etc. (PA, II, ii, 1).
29. The expression *Pūrv-āpar-Ākar-Āvanti* is usually rendered as "eastern and western Ākarāvanti" (IA, VII, p. 262; EI, VIII, p. 47), as if the compound is a *Karmadhāraya*. But that would violate the rule *Dik-saṅkhyē saṃjñāyām* (PA, II, i. 50). The interpretation of *pūrv-āpara* of Rudradāman's record in the sense of "counted from east to west" (JAIH, IV, p. 165, n), as if it is a *Tatpurusha* may not find a parallel in literature both Sanskrit and Pāli. (See SED, s.v.; PED, s.v. *pubba*). Besides, that interpretation, if accepted, would again reduce *pūrvāpara* to an unnecessary adjective as we saw already and it cannot absolve it from being a *dik-chhabda* (word denoting a point of compass). Hence its *Karmadhāraya* with *Ākara* etc. would necessarily go against the said rule of Pāṇini. One has no authority to dub the compound in the record as irregular simply to fall in line with the interpretation of some modern authors of repute.
30. See *Kāma., Adhi.* II, Ch. 5, *sū.* 22, 24 and 26 and the *Jayamaṅgala* commentary thereunder; *Mēgha.* I, verses 23, 24, 27, 30; *Kāda*, pp. 11-12, 116. See also BV, XXV, pp. 2, 5.
31. For a more elaborate discussion on the identification of Ākara with Khāndēsh see

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

the writer's papers *Rishika And Âkara* (JAIH, IV, pp. 159 ff; and '*Ākara*' *And* '*Ariake*' (ABORI, LII, pp. 221 ff).

32. See AIU, p. 61.
33. See ibid., p. 219; EHAC, p. 37; Com. HI., p. 112 f; EHD, p. 90.
34. Cf. *Dutiye cha vase achitayitā Sātakaṁnim pachhimadisaṁ haya-gaja-radha-bahulaṁ daṁḍaṁ paṭhāpayati; Kānhabeṁṇāṁ gatāya cha senāya vitāsiti Asikanagaram* l *S. Ins.* p. 215, text line 4.
35. See EHD, p. 93 f; AIU, p. 202.
36. See note 8 above.
37. See APGMS, No. 2.
38. EI, XXXV, pp. 77 ff.
39. Ibid., pp. 75 ff. The probability of one and the same Chuṭukula king enjoying both the designations has also been suggested by scholars. Ibid., p. 77.
40. APGMS, No. 2, pp. 30-31, Nos. 6-8. These Koṇḍāpur coins bear on their obverse, a figure of lion and above, a clear legend *Maharaṭhisa* and on the reverse, the Ujjain symbol.
41. Cf. APGMS, No. 2, pp. 13-16.
42. In a few cases the reading is *°japutasa Sagamāna-Chuṭukasa.* For divergent views on the legends of these coins from Koṇḍapur see EI, XXXV, pp. 75-76; XXXVII, p. 48 etc. For a detailed discussion on this question see the author's paper *The Controversial Legend of the Kondapur Coins* in JNSI, XXXIV pp. 36 ff.
43. See above Ch. II, sect. ii.
44. If the root *sag* 'to cover' (*The Siddhāntakaumudi*, root No. 789 *shagē*) is found in the *ātmanēpada* also, then Sagamāna itself may be a Sanskrit name, like Vardhamāna and Pātamāna from the roots *vṛidh* and *pat.*
45. Name of the Brāhmaṇa donee in the Malavalli inscription (LL, No. 1195).
46. Name of an individual in a Besnagar inscription (ibid., No. 671).
47. AIU, pp. 206-07.
48. JNSI, XV, p. 120; EI, XXXV, p. 77, type VI.
49. See DKA, p. 46 and n. 32; p. 72 and n. 11.
50. Op. cit. On palaeographical grounds the Banavasi record has been assigned to the first half of the 3rd century A.D. (AIU, p. 208, n.).
51. See EI, XX, p. 24, Inscr. H; SS, pp. 23-24. The Vanavāsa king of this inscription is generally taken to be a Chuṭu Sātakarṇi. Cf. APGMS, No. 5, p. 11.
52. Here and hereafter the respective dates of the Vākāṭaka kings are generally based on the chronological schemes of the family as worked out by Prof. Altekar (EHD, pp. 153 ff.) and by Prof. Mirashi (CII, V, p. iv). Even the schemes suggested by scholars like Prof. R.C. Majumdar (JRASB(L), XII, p. 1 ff.) may not seriously affect our study here.
53. CII, V, pp. xviii ff.
54. EHD, p. 159.
55. CII, V, p. xv.
56. Cf. *Anvavāya-nabhaś-chandraḥ Skandaśishyas=tatō=bhavat ' dvijānāṁ ghaṭikāṁ rājñaḥ Satyasēnāj=jahāra yaḥ* ‖ (SII, II, p. 508 verse 7).
57. For other interpretations of the passage and a different but untenable identification of Satyasēna in question, see HPK, p. 53; TPCP, Introd. (Tamil), page. v., etc.
58. CII, V, p. vii.
59. The Pallava Jinālaya of the Pudur (Gadwal Taluk, Mahbubnagar District) inscription of the time of the Chālukya Vikramāditya VI (No. B 28 of ARE 1965-66) probably indicates a later Noḷamba Pallava influence over the region.
60. See also CII, V, p. xiv ff.
61. Cf. EHD, p. 159.
62. *Uchchhvāsa* VIII. One may accept that some of the microscopic particulars of Daṇḍin's story might have been legendary or historical (*Dasakumāracharita*, Introd. p. xxxviii). Even then to give the narration much weight and to deduce some weighty conclusions on that basis alone may not be fully justifiable. So if the story of the *Visrutacharita* is compared with the contents of the Ajanta cave inscription of Varāhadēva (CII, V, pp. 107 ff.), then it would appear that the background of the story was provided by the Vidarbha history of the pre-Harishēṇa period and not of the post-Harishēṇa age as believed by some. (Cf. CII. V, pp. xxxii ff.). For a detailed discussion on this point see the author's paper *Historical Data in the Viśrutacharita* (*The Mysore Orientalist*, Vol. IV, pp. 30 ff.)
63. CII, V, p. xv.
64. The reading in the inscription is not *Triparvata* at all. Cf. JIH, XII, p. 356; CA, p. 271.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

65. The Talagunda inscription, EI, VIII, p. 32, verses 18-21.
66. AHD, p. 92.
67. No. I, lines 1-2.
68. No. VIII, line 2.
69. Cf. No. II, line 1.
70. See No. I and VIII.
71. Cf. e.g. the case of the Vākāṭaka capital Pravarapura founded by, and named after, Pravarasēna II. EHD, p. 180; CII, V, p. xxiv.
72. CA, p. 206; EI, XXXVI, p. 4.
73. See EHD, pp. 179, 186.
74. ARE, 1915, p. 91; JDL, XI, p. 52 and n.
75. See e.g., AHD, p. 90; EHD, p. 159.
76. For other instances of similar nature see below Ch. V, sect. III. Cf. AIOC, XIII, pt. ii, p. 425. Also see EHD, p. 159; ARE 1915, p. 91; ED, pp. 522-23.
77. AIOC, XIII, pt. ii, p. 425.
78. CA, p. 179, n.
79. CII, III, pp. 40-41.
80. See ibid., p. 43.
81. CII, V, p. xxiv.
82. Though a staunch devotee of Vishṇu, the queen might have given some gifts to the temple atleast at the instance of her son, who though a Śaiva, built a temple of Rāma at her instance. See ibid., p. xxv.
83. The same friendly policy seems to have been followed by the Vākāṭakas of the main line towards the Kuntala kings also who had been earlier subjugated by Vindhyaśakti II of the Vatsagulma line. (See CII, V, p. 108, verse 8). This is suggested by the marriage of the Kuntala princess Ajjhitabhaṭṭārikā with Narēndrasēna of the main branch. (See ibid., p. 81, text lines 30-31). That is why in the succeeding period Harishēṇa of Vatsagulma embarked upon an expedition, evidently a punitive one, against the kings of Kuntala, Andhra (*i.e.* the Vishṇukuṇḍi), Kōsala and Mālava (ibid. p. 108, verse 18) all of whom had been favoured by the Vākāṭaka rulers of the main branch (See ibid. p. 81, lines 27-31).
84. This is not a special feature of the Vishṇukuṇḍi charters alone. Cf. the contemporary charters of the Vākāṭakas in the north and the Pallavas in the south. For the injunction of the *Smṛitis* on this point, see *Vīra. Vyavahāra.*, p. 144, and *Kṛitya. Vyavahāra.*, pp. 157-58. See also below n. 89.
85. In the Vishṇukuṇḍi charters often the kings themselves are found acting as executors.
86. See Ch. V, sect. iii; Ch. VII, sect. i.
87. Cf. *Vīra. Vyavahāra.*, p. 145 and *Kṛitya. Vyavahāra.*, p. 161.
88. Under such circumstances the creation of new charters are sanctioned by the *Smṛiti* literature. Cf. *Vīra. Vyavahara*, p. 147.
89. A parallel instance may be found in the case of some Pallava charters. While all the charters of that family contain the orders of the respective monarchs addressed to the officers and residents of the gift villages informing them of the royal grants, the Ongodu grant of Siṁhavarman (EI, XV, pp. 252 ff.) and the Udayendiram charters of Nandivarman I (ibid., III, pp. 142 ff.) and of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla (SII, II, pp. 361 ff.) contain mere statements of facts that the respective kings had gifted away the respective villages. It is to be noted that the characters of these charters are to be assigned to the ages much later than that of their respective kings. Scholars are of the opinion that these may be the later copies of their respective earlier originals (See EI, XV, p. 252; SS, pp. 199, 209; TPCP, pp. 108, 332, 350). It is likely that these too are not true copies, but adapted versions, of their respective originals.
90. Cf. the expression *sthiti-sthāpanā*. See SED, s.v. Cf. also the passage *Sthity=ānayā pūrva-nṛip-ānujushṭayā yat=tāmra-paṭṭēshu nibaddham=ādau* etc. in a grant of the Kadamba king Ravivarman (IA VI, p. 26, lines 22-23) and *Sthitiś=ch=ēyaṁ purō baddhā dharmyā stambhē nivēśitā* in the Podagadh inscription of the Nala king Skandavarman. (EI, XXI, pp. 155 ff.) In the last mentioned record the Nala king claims to have restored the royal fortunes of his family and to have repopulated the forsaken city Pushkara. Likewise, by means of this record he might have restored in that area a grant originally made to god Pususha (*i.e.* Vishṇu) by someone. Cf. *Purushāya purā dattam* in the same record (verse 5). The reading *puraṁ dattam* does not appear to be correct.
91. The word *ātmanaḥ* before the regnal year is quite unusual in the Vishṇukuṇḍi charters and it occurs here immediately

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

after the name of the donor Gōvindavarman. Probably it was purposely used to indicate that the regnal year 37 quoted was of Gōvindavarman I and not of the restorer *viz.*, perhaps Vikramēndravarman II. It may be pointed out that in the later adapted copies of the Udayendiram (I) and Ongodu (II) records too we find respectively the expression *tasya* (line 37) and *sva* (line 31) before the regnal years while they are not at all met with in other records of the Pallavas.

92. No. I, lines 4-5.
93. Ibid., lines 5-6.
94. No. III, lines 3.
95. No. VIII, lines 22-23.
96. See below Ch. VII, Sect. i.
97. Cf, QJMS, XXX, p. 310. See Ch. IV. Sect. ii; Ch. V, Sect. ii, and Appendix V.
98. *Paramamahādēvī* may be a name, though *Paramabhaṭṭārikāmahādēvī* reminds us of a title borne by the queens of the later Guptas of Magadha (CA, p. 352).
99. See also Ch. VII, Sect. i.
100. No. III, line 2.
101. No. I, line 11.
102. Ibid., line 6.
103. Ibid., lines 6-11; No. III, line 2.
104. Nos. I, lines 8-9; VIII, lines 24-25.
105. No. VIII, lines 26-28. This sort of description we can expect only from an author who had the knowledge of Gōvindarāja's predecessors and successors of the family upto the time of Vikramēndravarman II. Therefore Gōvindavarman-Gōvindarāja of No. VIII must have ruled sometime earlier than Vikramēndravarman II. The view that the above Gōvindavarman was the successor of Vikramēndravarman II (JAHRS, XXXI, p. 41 ff; JMU, XXXVIII, pp. 229 ff.) misses the above point. Besides we have already pointed out the chronological difficulties that are inherent in that view. The rendering of *Śrī-Pārvatēya-purv-āpara-kshitipati* as the "kings on the eastern and western sides of the Śrīparvata" (EA, II, p. 7, n. 5)violates grammar. See above n. 29.
106. See AHD, p. 90.
107. CII, V, p. xxxi. See also EHD, p. 188. An equally untenable suggestion is that Gōvindavarman or his son Mādhavavarman, as the vassals of the Vākāṭaka Harisheṇa, conquered Andhra (QJMS, XXX, p. 312).
108. Nos. I, line 12; VIII, lines 3-4.
109. No. III, line 1.
110. CA, p. 259.
111. CII, V, p. 12, line 16; etc.
112. MASI, No. 54 (1938), p. 6.
113. An analogous instance may be found in the case of Harshavardhana's religion. He is described unequivocally as a Śaiva in his own charters and in his biography written by Bāṇa. But the statements of Yuan Chwang would make us believe that the Pushyabhūti emperor was not only a devout follower of Buddhism, but also showed disrespect to all the other religious sects including Śaivism. Naturally scholars are inclined to accept the account of that Buddhist pilgrim from China only "with more than usual reserve." See CA. pp, 117 ff.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CHAPTER IV

ZENITH OF THE VISHṆUKUṆḌI POWER

The Tummalagudem record (I) is dated in the 37th regnal year of Gōvindavarman. Therefore assuming that he ruled for about 40 years, we may suggest that by 462 A.D. his reign came to an end. He was succeeded by his son Mādhavavarman II, also called Mādhavarāja in one place.[1] It will be seen below that during the reign of this Mādhavavarman, the dynasty reached the peak point of its glory.

(I) INSCRIPTIONS OF MĀDHAVAVARMAN II

Of the time of Mādhavavarman we have got the following three records:

(1) *The Velpuru Pillar Inscription*: This epigraph takes the place of pride as it is the only known lithic record of the Vishṇukuṇḍi dynasty. But unfortunately it is very much mutilated and fragmentary. Palaeographically this record is earlier than the Ramatīrtham plates and resembles the Ipur set I. It is dated in the full moon day of the month Taisha (*i.e.* Pausha) of the 33rd regnal year of the king Mādhavavarman. Herein the king is described as the son of Gōvindavarman of the family of Vishṇukuṇḍi, the meditator on the feet of the Lord of the Śrīparvata. Unlike in all the other records of the family, neither the father nor the son is endowed with any title in the present record, even the simple honorific *śrī* also being dispensed with.

The epigraph introduces a prince bearing the title *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja* as the governor of what is called Vēlpūrudēśa, as a victor of many battles and perhaps as a person obeyed by a Pallava ruler. It is really a matter of pity that neither the personal name of this *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja*, nor that of the Pallava ruler is preserved in the available portion of the record. The epigraph further informs us that the above Vishṇukuṇḍi prince visited the army camp located in the place (*iha* 'here', *i.e.* 'at Vēlpūru') and was ordered there by Mādhavavarman to do something, details of which are lost. There seems to be a reference to the setting up of an *ānaka* or war-drum probably by the same *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja* who also appears to have set up, under the orders of the king (*i.e.* Mādhavavarman), an image of the Elephant-faced Vināyaka and worshipped the same with great care after gifting away gold. It may be noted that the month Taisha and the full-moon day which are the details of the date of this record are favoured by the literature for the consecration of idols.[2] A passage, like a *phalaśruti* (promise of reward), at the end of the epigraph seems to indicate that all these actions were intended to achieve victory. There is also a reference to the worship of the said Vināyaka by people in general. The Vēlpūrudēśa of the record must be obviously the region around the modern Vēlpūru, the findspot of the record in the Guntur District.

(2) *The Ipur Plates* (Set I): The characters of this charter are definitely earlier than those of the Ramatirtham and Chikkulla plates as Dr. Hultzsch has pointed

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

out.[3] It is dated in the 15th day of the seventh fortnight of the summer season of the 37th regnal year of Mādhavavarman, son of Gōvindavarman. It is issued by the king from his victorious camp at Kuḍāvāḍa and records an order addressed to the residents of the village Vilēmballi in the Guddādi *vishaya* informing them of his grant of the village, made tax-free, in favour of a Brāhmaṇa by name Agniśarman belonging to the Vatsa *gōtra*. The grant is said to have been made for the prosperity of the royal family. The executor of the grant was one Mañchyaṇṇabhaṭṭāraka, described as a beloved son, evidently of the king. In this charter Mādhavavarman bears a number of titles including those that credit him with the performance of eleven *Aśvamēdhas*, *Agnishṭōma-sahasra* and the *Hiraṇya-garbhamahādāna*. Another title describes him to have delighted the heart of the ladies of Trivaranagara. These titles distinguish him from his namesakes who were his grandfather and grandson. But they do not exclude Mādhavavarman IV.[4]

The Guddādi *vishaya* of this charter may be the same as Guddavādi-vishaya of the Polamuru plates and it seems to have comprised roughly parts of the East Godavari District. Accordingly, the gift village Vilēmballi of the present grant may be identified with Velampālem (16° 48′ N. and 82° 3′ E.) very near Drākshārāma in Ramachandrapuram Taluk.[5] The king's camping place Kuḍāvāḍa may be identified with the modern Guḍivāḍa (17° 8′ N. and 82° 9′ E.) in the Peddapuram Taluk of the East Godavari District.[6] The city Trivaranagara, the hearts of whose young women Mādhavavarman claims to have delighted seems to be the residential headquarters of the monarch as suggested by Dr. Hultzsch.[7] This place may be identified with Tiruvūru (17° 10′ N. and 80° 35′ E.) the headquarter of the taluk of that name in the Krishna District.[8]

(3) *The Khanapur Plates* : The first plate of this charter is missing and even the second plate is not fully preserved. Hence the record is fragmentary. The characters of this charter, though carelessly engraved, are comparable, as has been suggested by Prof. Mirashi, with those of the charters of the early Rāshṭrakūṭas of Mānapura.[9] The available portion of the record describes Mādhavavarman as an emperor (*sārvabhauma*) and as a performer of eleven *Pauṇḍarīkas* and eleven *Bahusuvarṇas* and as a protector of the *Varṇāśramadharma*. It also refers to his desire to grant in favour of two Brāhmaṇa scholars (*viz.*, Balasvāmin of the Śālaṅkāyana *gōtra* and of the Chhandōga school and Kēśavasvāmin of the Bhāradvāja *gōtra*) a village named Rēṭṭūraka, excluding one-fourth of it that had been earlier gifted probably to some other Brāhmaṇa. It seems further to record a gift of the same village, *viz.*, Rēṭṭūraka (*i.e.*, 3/4 of it), by an individual, evidently a high personage, whose name is not preserved. On the whole the language of the text suggests that by issuing this charter some dignitary, probably a king, had granted Rēṭṭūraka as desired by Mādhavavarman.[10] The grant was made on a *Mahāvaiśākhī Pūrṇimā*. Scholars have already satisfactorily identified the gift village of grant, *viz* , Rēṭṭūraka with Retare Budruku (Larger Retare, Karhad Taluk, Satara District) which lies to the South-east of the Kṛishṇa-Vēṇṇā as stated in the inscription. Similarly, they have also identified[11] the village mentioned as boundaries of Rēṭṭūraka, and the *vāṭikās* and the *tīrthas* the village contained.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Identification of Mādhavavarman of the Velpuru Inscription: The palaeography of the record; the influence of Prakrit on the language and the simplicity of the text;[12] and the reference to the *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja* who was probably identical with the one mentioned in the Ipur set II; [13] all these go to indicate that the record belongs to a period much earlier than that of the Polamuru record (I) of Mādhavavarman IV. Again, as we shall see later, the territory that lies south of the Kṛishṇā seems to have been lost by the Vishṇukuṇḍis to the Pallavas sometime before Mādhavavarman IV came to the throne. [14] Therefore the king of the Velpuru record may better be identified with Mādhavavarman II, rather than with Mādhavavarman IV.

Identification of Mādhavavarman of the Ipur Set I: The characters of the record; the influence of Prakrit on the language and the brevity of the text; and the comparatively small number of epithets of the king may indicate the early nature of the record and may favour the identification of the king of this charter with the second Mādhavavarman and not with the fourth king of that name. This suggestion may well find support from the fact that the distinguishing titles *Vikramāśraya* and *Janāśraya* respectively of Gōvindavarman II and Mādhavavarman IV are conspicuous by their absence in the present record.

One more point worthy of consideration in this connection is this. Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru set I is described not only as the son of one Gōvindavarman but also as the grandson of one Vikramahēndravarman, *i.e.*,Vikramēndravarman. At the same time the reference to the grandfather is conspicuously absent in the Velpuru and Ipur (I) records. On the strength of this, it is logical to presume that Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru plates has been purposely described as the grandson of Vikramēndravarman in order to distinguish him from his earlier namesake *viz.*, Mādhavavarman II, who was also the son of a Gōvindavarman. A sort of parallelism may be found in the case of the Kushāṇa king Kanishka II, who, by calling himself as the son of Vājeshka (*i.e.* Vasishka), distinguished himself from Kanishka I;[15] and also in the case of the Eastern Gaṅga Indravarman IV who marked himself off from his predecessor and namesake by describing himself as the son of Dānārṇava.[16] Therefore the ascription of the Velpuru and Ipuru (I) records to Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru set I[17] requires modification.

Identification of Mādhavavarman of the Khanapur Plates: In deciding the identity of this king some difficulty has been felt by scholars. Some have taken this king to be not known so far to history[18] while others proposed to take him for some hitherto unknown king of the Rāshṭrakūṭa dynasty of Mānapura.[19] However, believing that there is a reference to Mādhavavarman's eleven *Aśvamēdhas* they concluded later on that the monarch must be the Vishṇukuṇḍi Mādhavavarman as the latter was the only king of that name claiming eleven *Aśvamēdhas* during the period under question.[20] But, some scholars remained unconvinced of the above identification, for the reason that this charter of Mādhavavarman records his gift of land in the Satara District and therefore the above identification would drive us to assign "a very vast empire to the otherwise unknown dynasty of the Vishṇukuṇḍis."[21] As against this contention it has been stressed by other group of scholars that the kingdom of the Vishṇukuṇḍi Mādhavavarman, the performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* must have been certainly large enough to include the Satara District.[22] Now,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

though the identification is almost upheld[23] the charter has been set aside as spurious, probably on the ground that the charter recording a grant of land in Satara region by Mādhavavarman of the Vishṇukuṇḍi dynasty "would suggest that the king had led a successful expedition against the western part of the Deccan".[24] But, as has been earlier pointed out, the Khanapur charter was issued probably not by Mādhavavarman himself but by some other person granting lands in the Satara District as desired by Mādhavavarman. Later it will be seen that the issuer of the charter was perhaps a member of the Rāshṭrakūṭa family of Mānapura.[25] Therefore, the gift recorded in the Khanapur plates may not indicate that the Western Deccan formed part of Mādhavavarman's kingdom. Hence the record need not be characterised as spurious. Nor is it necessary to believe, as has been done by some, in Mādhavavarman's occupation of the Western Deccan to explain the epithet *Trikūṭamalayādhipati* of Mādhavavarman, the younger,[26] of the Ipur plates (II). Instances of kings making grants in others' territories are not unknown in Indian history and epigraphy.[27] Thus there can be no objection to identify the king Mādhavavarman of the Khanapur charter with the Vishṇukuṇḍi monarch of that name.

Again, the description of Mādhavavarman of the record as a performer of eleven *Pauṇḍarīkas* and eleven *Bahusuvarṇas* points to the fact that the king must have been no other than Mādhavavarman II. For, even Mādhavavarman IV claims eleven *Aśvamēdhas* only and not a single *Pauṇḍarīka* or *Bahusuvarṇa*. Secondly, the way in which Mādhavavarman is described in the Khanapur plates, seems to indicate that the issuer of the charter was an ally, probably a subordinate ally of the Vishṇukuṇḍi monarch. The rulers of the Satara region who were contemporaries of the earlier Mādhavavarman II were the members of the Rāshṭrakūṭa dynasty and they were struggling, as we shall see later, against theVākāṭakas. Consequently it is likely that a member of this Rāshṭrakuta family chose to be an ally, or even a subordinate ally of the Vishṇukuṇḍi as the description of the latter as *sārvabhauma* would suggest. On the other hand, the contemporaries of Mādhavavarman IV (c. 565-612 A.D.) in the area were the powerful kings like the Chālukya Kīrttivarman I and his successors and it is unlikely that any of them might have been a subordinate ally of the Vishṇukuṇḍi, though there might have existed some good relationship between the two dynasties during that time also, as we shall see later.

(II) CAREER OF MĀDHAVAVARMAN II

When Mādhavavarman II came to power in the early sixties of the fifth century A.D., the Vākāṭaka Dēvasēna was ruling in Vatsagulma. That the latter was a ruler even from an earlier date than Śaka 380 (457-58 A.D.) is evidenced by his own Hisse-Borala inscription.[28] The Ajanta Cave inscription of Varāhadēva clearly describes this Vākaṭaka king as a pleasure-loving monarch having no interest in the administration of the kingdom.[29] Obviously Mādhavavarman must have taken full advantage of the situation and declared independence. Perhaps as a mark of his newly acquired sovereignty he performed the *Aśvamēdhas*. A large number of Vishṇukuṇḍi coins have been unearthed in the Karimnagar District.[30] A tradition also speaks of one Mādhavavarman of the fifth century as the progenitor of some Hanumakoṇḍa (near Warangal) kings of the pre-Kākatīya period.[31] These obviously indicate that Mādhavavarman II extended his kingdom, presumably at the expense

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

of the Vākāṭakas, as far north as the banks of the Gōdāvarī in the central Andhra. It is likely that said tradition suggests that the newly acquired territory was put under the control of some Vishṇukuṇḍi prince appointed as a governor.

The Sālaṅkāyana power in the east was already on the wane.[32] Mādhavavarman must have enhanced his prestige by overthrowing the last Sālaṅkāyana ruler and by annexing the latter's territory of Vēṅgī. Thus the Bay of Bengal came to be the eastern boundary of the Vishṇukuṇḍi kingdom.

Mādhavavarman's ambition did not stop at that. He embarked upon the conquest of his southern neighbour. He appears to have led his army southward across the river Kṛishṇā with a view to conquer the Guntur region. His Velpuru record clearly shows that earlier than his 33rd regnal year, the Vēlpūru *dēśa* in the northern part of the Guntur District had been ruled by a Vishṇukuṇḍi prince evidently as a governor under Mādhavavarman. The record also suggests that the king was actually busy in preparing for a war in the region during that year. For, it speaks of his presence in his military camp at Vēlpūru and refers to the act of setting up of a war drum, the gift of gold in large quantity and the worship of Vināyaka—all the three acts were performed obviously for achieving a victory. The *Gṛihyasūtras* and the *Purāṇas* prescribe the offer of prayers to the war-drum by the king as a part of the *raṇa-dīkshā* or ritual in connection with the preparation for a war.[33] Maybe, the act of setting up of a war-drum by the prince under the orders of Mādhavavarman was in connection with a *raṇa-dīkshā*. Again the gift of gold referred to in the record reminds us of the one stated to have been made by the Pāṇḍavas in their army camp on the eve of the Kurukshētra war.[31] Similarly, the worship of Vināyaka is also connected with the *raṇa-dīkshā*.[35] There are many references in literature to the worship of Vināyaka as a part of the *raṇa-dīkshā*.[36] Therefore it is not unlikely that being an ardent follower of the Vēdic religion,[37] Mādhavavarman performed the above rituals for achieving victory in his war.

Now arise three questions: (1) Who was this *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja* referred to in the Velpuru record? (2) From whom did Mādhavavarman wrest the Vēlpūru area? (3) Who was the king against whom Mādhavavarman was preparing for the war? Being very fragmentary, the said record does not help us in answering these questions directly. Regarding the first question, one may however identify *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja* (perhaps a Vishṇukuṇḍi prince) of the Vēlpūru record with Guṇabharttā who figures as the *ājñapti* in the Ipur set II and who is also found designated as *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja*.[38] For, there was no other Vishṇukuṇḍi prince known to have borne such a designation. He could have been either another son or a grandson of Mādhavavarman II.[39]

Coming to the second and the third questions, it may be guggested that the person or power from whom the Vēlpūru *dēśa* had been wrested earlier, was the same against whom Mādhavavarman was preparing for a war. After the disappearance of the Sātavāhanas the area under question had been under the Ikshvākus in the second and third centuries of the Christian era and later on it was conquered by the Pallavas.[40] The Ānandas succeeded in driving out the Pallavas from the area subsequently and the kings of the dynasty like Kandara, Dāmōdaravarman and Attivarman ruled over the territory most probably in the fourth century. Yet, the

CC-0. Jangamwadi Math Collection. Digitized by eGangotri. Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Pallavas managed to reconquer the area later, reducing the Ānandas to vassalage.[41] There is nothing to show that the Sālaṅkāyana kingdom, which Mādhavavarman II had appropriated for himself earlier had included the Vēlpūru-dēśa.[42] Therefore most probably the area was conquered by Mādhavavarman from the Pallavas. The description of the *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja* in the record as being bowed by a Pallava seems to vouch for this suggestion. Similarly the war which Mādhavavarman was preparing for in his 33rd year in the southernmost part of his kingdom must have been a southerner only, *viz.*, a Pallava.

Regarding the identity of the Pallava adversary of Mādhavavarman the following may be suggested: It will be seen later[43] that it was the Pallava Siṁhavarman of the Māṅgaḷūru grant [44] who invaded the Vishṇukuṇḍi territory, north of the Kṛishṇā, during the reign of Vikramēndravarman II, and was subsequently driven out by that Vishṇukuṇḍi king. From this, it is reasonable to say that the Pallava contemporary of Mādhavavarman, the great grandfather of Vikramēndravarman II must have been very probably the said Siṁhavarman's great grandfather Vīravarman or the latter's father Skandavarman I.[45] In this connection it may be remembered that while there are copper plate charters of the Pallava Kumāravishṇu,[46] the father of the said Skandavarman and of all the successors of the said Vīravarman, no record of the time of Skandavarman or Vīravarman has come to light.[47] This fact probably indicates a temporary eclipse of the Pallava rule in the region during the period in question. So it may not be wrong if the Pallava opponent of Mādhavavarman is identified with Skandavarman or his son Vīravarman.[48]

The cause of the war is not known. The said Pallava king Kumāravishṇu restored the fallen fortunes of the family and performed the *Aśvamēdha*.[49] He may be assigned roughly to the middle of the fifth century A.D. His son Skandavarman I is stated to have obtained the country by his own valour[50] while the latter's son Vīravarman is pictured as an inimitable hero, victorious in many a battle.[51] It is probable that the latter fell in a battle. At any rate, the above description of the Pallava princes indicates beyond doubt that the warlike career started by Kumāravishṇu was continued by his successors. There is no wonder that these two expanding powers, *viz.*, the Pallava and the Vishṇukuṇḍi confronted one another on the banks of the Kṛishṇā to test the strength of their arms. In a fray that followed the arms of the Vishṇukuṇḍi seem to have proved stronger. The battle ended in favour of Mādhavavarman, who, as a result, extended his territory further south, so as to include the Vēlpūru *dēśa* sometime before his 33rd regnal year. The second battle for which the Vishṇukuṇḍi was preparing in that year seems to have yielded to him the territory further south. As a measure of guarding the explosive frontiers, he kept the newly acquired area under the governorship of his beloved grandson, Mādhavavarman III,[52] round about 495 A.D. Kielhorn, had suggested a probability of the connection between the name Vinukoṇḍa of a hill-station in the Guntur District on one hand and the dynastic name Vishṇukuṇḍi on the other. Possibly that hill formed part, or the southern headquarters of the new Vishṇukuṇḍi power and was named after the dynastic name of the conqueror, as it seems to have been the custom with the Andhra Sātavāhanas in the earlier centuries.[53]

As regards the activities of the Vishṇukuṇḍis in the territory beyond th Gōdāvarī in the eastern Andhra, it has been earlier seen that probably the sphere of

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

influence of Gōvindavarman had already included atleast the southern part of the present East Godavari District. That the kingdom of Mādhavavarman included the area is confirmed by the Ipur set I recording his own grant of a village in the Ramachandrapuram Taluk. In this connection the following facts may also be worth considering:

(1) The Ipur set I tells us that Mādhavavarman was camping with his army at a place in Peddapuram Taluk. This place is not far removed from Pīṭhāpuram, *i.e.*, the ancient Pishṭapura. (2) The charters of the Māṭhara and Vāsiṣṭha kings ruling over the Pishṭapura region may have to be assigned to about the 5th century A.D.[54] Nothing is subsequently known about these families. (3) In the subsequent period there was a line of kings of the Rāmakāśyapa *gōtra* ruling from Pishṭapura owing allegiance to the Vishṇukuṇḍi monarchs, as we shall see later. The cumulative effect of these evidences tends to suggest that perhaps before his 37th year, *i.e.*, in the last quarter of the fifth century, Mādhavavarman managed to conquer Pishṭapura area from the Māṭharas and others who too had probably exhausted their strength by their mutual wars and by their fight with other Kaliṅga rulers.[55] It is likely that Mādhavavarman appointed an early member of the family of the Rāmakāśyapa *gōtra* kings as his own governor to rule over the Pishṭapura region. It is also very likely that the arms of Mādhavavarman penetrated as far as the Srikakulam District and that the early members of the Gaṅga family of Kaliṅga owed allegiance to him.[56]

There is no direct evidence to show the relationship of Mādhavavarman with his northern neighbours. However in this context the following points may be noted: (1) In the Tummalagudem set II, Mādhavavarman II is described as a ruler of a territory extending as far north as the Narmadā river—a description, which may not be altogether without some substance during the period under question. (2) The Vākāṭakas continued to be supreme in the Deccan till the end of the fifth century, though they had to struggle hard quite often to maintain that position. Therefore any political move in the north by Mādhavavarman must have been in connection with the politics of the Vākāṭakas. (3) As we shall see later, Mādhavavarman II was perhaps a son-in-law of the Vākāṭaka Pravarasēna II of the main branch. Bearing these points in mind we may state the following: The efficient rule of the said Pravarasēna II for more than 32 years[57] ended round about the middle of the 5th century A.D., and he was succeeded by his son Narēndrasēna. An epithet of the latter in the Balaghat plates seems to indicate that he got his family fortunes brought or offered back to him. This suggests that the fortunes of the Vākāṭakas had been in jeopardy and that in getting them back from the enemy, Narēndrasēna was helped by somebody, *i.e.*, by some friends.[58] Though one cannot be quite sure about the identity of those friends, it is highly probable that the Vākāṭaka monarch was helped in this context by his brother-in-law, the Vishṇukuṇḍi Mādhavavarman who was more powerful than other rulers of his time in the Deccan.[59]

The worse days again came to the Vākāṭaka kingdom. The family sank subsequently on two occasions and the burden of restoring it fell on the shoulders of Narēndrasēna's son Pṛithivīshēṇa.[60] It is hardly possible to be definite about the cause, nature and the dates of these two Vākāṭaka debacles. However, it is likely that one of the misfortunes of Pṛithivīshēṇa's reign may be, as suggested by Altekar, due

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

to the invasion of his kingdom by Dharasēna (460-80 A.D.) the ruler of the region of the Trikūṭa mountain in the west.[61] In this connection it may be borne in mind that Mādhavavarman III, the grandson of and a provincial governor under Mādhavavarman II styled himself as a lord of the Trikūṭa, a claim which may probably indicate that the Vishṇukuṇḍi joined those who defeated the rulers of that mountain.[62] All these tend to point out a possibility of Mādhavavarman's role in helping the Vākāṭaka against the Traikūṭaka by despatching an army under his grandson. The second misfortune that befell the Vākāṭaka empire must have been Pṛithivīshēṇa's struggle with the rising Harishēṇa of the Vatsagulma branch.[63] The interference of the latter in Andhra politics and the set-back the Vishṇukuṇḍi suffered during the subsequent period[61] seem to hint at a probability that Mādhavavarman might have joined his hands with Pṛithivīshēṇa against Harishēṇa.

Assigning Mādhavavarman II to a period between 500 A.D. and 550 A.D.; viewing him to be a son-in-law of Harishēṇa; treating the Khanapur charter as a record issued by Mādhavavarman II himself; identifying Trivaranagara of the king's title *Trivaranagara* etc., with the city of Tīvara of South Kōsala; and taking into account Mādhavavarman's performance of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and his grandson's title *Trikūṭamalayādhipati*; some writers have come to a conclusion that Mādhavavarman, by "his relationship with the Vākāṭaka, must have considered himself a rightful heir to the Vākāṭaka empire (after Harishēṇa)", and "embarked upon an extensive scheme of *digvijaya* and soon brought Mahārāshṭra, Vidarbha, Dakshiṇa-Kōsala and Karnāṭaka under his sway."[65] But all these conclusions are to be dropped in view of the Vishṇukuṇḍi chronology we have constructed,[66] and in view of the more probable interpretations of the said titles, as we have already seen. Even those scholars who look upon Mādhavavarman II as a son-in-law of Harishēṇa of Vatsagulma do not minimise the part played by the Vishṇukuṇḍi king in the Vākāṭaka politics. They too regard that a boyish prince, perhaps a grandson of Harishēṇa, might have got the help of Mādhavavarman in driving the allegedly treacherous feudatories out of the country of the Vākāṭakas.[67]

Our knowledge of the history of South Kōsala (*i.e.* the present Raipur-Bilaspur-Sambalpur region) of the period between 400 A.D. and 500 A D. is next to nothing[68] and it is therefore hardly possible to determine Mādhavavarman's political activities in connection with that area. However, from the Balaghat plates of Pṛithivīshēṇa it is known that the king of Kōsala (*i.e.*, South Kōsala) was a feudatory of Narēndrasēna. Hence, it may tentatively be suggested that the relationship of Mādhavavarman with the king of Kōsala was quite normal. However, it is also likely that Narēndrasēna's claim of the overlordship of South Kōsala indicates his military achievement in the area that lay, till very recently, within the sphere of the Gupta influence.[69] In that case here may lie a reason to believe that Mādhavavarman might have extended his helping hand to the Vākāṭaka in that connection also.[70]

One cannot be quite sure about the western boundaries of Mādhavavarman's kingdom. It has already been said that the home province of the Vishṇukuṇḍis comprised roughly the modern districts of Nalgonda and Mahbubnagar. And there is nothing to show that the Mahbubnagar region was under the rule of any other

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

power during the period we are concerned with. So, it is not unreasonable to think that the western boundary of the Vishṇukuṇḍi kingdom was roughly marked by the Bhīmā river if not by anything else in further west. The Khanapur record gives us some clue to know about the nature of the Mādhavavarman's connection with his western neighbour. The facts that the record was issued by some ruler of the area donating land, as desired by Mādhavavarman and that the latter is described as a *sārvabhauma* 'a paramount ruler' seem to indicate a friendly relationship that existed between Mādhavavarman II and the donor of the charter. During the period under discussion the Rāshṭrakūtas of Mānapura were ruling over the southern Mahārāshṭra wherefrom the record comes. For, as the Gokak (Belgaum District) plates of the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Dējjamahārāja[71] are dated in the Āguptāyika year 845 which is usually equated to 532-33 A.D.,[72] the earlier members of the family, *viz.*, Avidhēya, the donor of the Pāṇḍaraṅgapalli grant,[73] and his brother Bhavishya and the latter's son Abhimanyu, the donor of the Uṇḍivāṭikā grant[74] may be referred to a period between 450 and 525 A.D.[75]

Mānāṅka, the grandfather of Avidhēya is said to have frightened both Vidarbha and Aśmaka,[76] of which one is to be identified with the kingdom of Vatsagulma.[77] This clearly indicates that Mānāṅka declared independence, just as Gōvindavarman did, during the period of confusion in Vatsagulma following the death of Vindhyaśakti II. Mānāṅka's son Dēvarāja and his successors, therefore, might have ruled contemporaneously with Vindhyaśakti's son Pravarasēna II, the latter's son (name not preserved in the Ajanta inscription) and Dēvasēna in Vatsagulma on one hand and Gōvindavarman I and Mādhavavarman II in Andhra on the other. Therefore it is likely that the common cause of achieving complete freedom from the Vākāṭaka yoke brought the Rāshṭrakūṭas and the Vishṇukuṇḍis together to a single fold, just like a similar cause united many chiefs in the subsequent period against Indrabhaṭṭāraka.[78]

Moreover, the name Dēvavarman of the Vishṇukuṇḍi prince who was the son of Mādhavavarman is a singular and unique instance among the names met with in the list of the Vishṇukuṇḍi princes. Secondly, while Mādhavavarman's another son Vikramēndravarman I is found claiming to be a son of a Vākāṭaka princess, Dēvavarman had no such claim. Therefore, it is certain that the latter's mother did not belong to the family of the Vākāṭakas. So taking into consideration these facts, together with the contemporaneity of the Rāshṭrakuṭa Dēvarāja and the Vishṇukuṇḍi Gōvindavarman I, and the usual practice of naming the grandsons after their grandfathers, one may provisionally suggest that the above mentioned political alliance between the Rāshṭrakūṭa and Vishṇukuṇḍi families was well cemented by the marriage of Dēvarāja's daughter with the Vishṇukuṇḍi Mādhavavarman II and that Dēvavarman was a product of that marriage.

To the south of the kingdom of the Rashṭrakūṭas of Mānapura lay the kingdom of Banavāsi of the Kadambas. There is no direct evidence to indicate the nature of relationship that might have existed between the Kadambas and the Vishṇukuṇḍis. Yet, as we saw earlier, on the basis of the lion-crest that was common to both these dynasties, Dubreuil had suggested a family relationship between them.[79] It has been pointed out earlier that the rise of the Kadambas under Mayūraśarman was

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

probably due to the support that the Kadamba warrior received, atleast to some extent, from the chieftains at Śrīparvata, the home land of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. In this connection it may also be remembered that the queen of the Vākāṭaka Narēndrasēna, *viz.*, Ajjhitabhaṭṭārikā is said to be a daughter of the ruler of the Kuntala country usually identified with the kingdom of Banavāsi.[80] Therefore there did exist a family connection between them through the said Narēndrasēna and his son whom Mādhavavarman helped more than once. So, having no proof to the contrary one may suggest that Mādhavavarman perhaps continued the traditional friendly relation with the Kadambas.

To sum up, Mādhavavarman extended his kingdom atleast upto the middle valley of the Gōdāvarī, exterminated the Sālaṅkāyana dynasty at Vēṅgī, conquered Pishṭapura and Śrīkākulam area from the rulers of the region and thus extended his kingdom to the eastern sea. He vanquished the Pallava of the South more than once and wrested from him the area of the Guntur District. He helped the Vākāṭaka rulers of the main line often and tried successfully to avert the destruction of their kingdom by the inroads of their enemies. He maintained scrupulously a cordial and good relationship with the Rāshṭrakūṭas of the Western Deccan and with the Kadambas of the further south. Thus he did influence the politics of the whole of the *Dakshiṇāpatha* or the peninsular India (*i.e.* the *Chakravarttikshētra* in the south).[81] What wonder if he is praised[82] to have forcibly seized from other reputed royal families their loyal territories and to be a protector of the earth surrounded by the seas in the east, south and west and by the waters of the Rēvā, *i.e.* the Narmadā in the north ?[83]

The above study of Mādhavavarman's career would show that the political achievements of this king followed one after another in quick succession. Naturally his prestige must have been ever on the ascent. He had before him the example of the Vākāṭakas, who had been once the overlords of the members of the Vishṇukuṇḍi family. He married a Vākāṭaka princess and found the rulers of her family boasting themselves of their glory exhibited by a surprisingly large number of royal sacrifices performed by Pravarasēna I. He also noticed the Bharaśiva Nāgas, also related to the Vākāṭakas by marriage, exhibiting their glory by the performance of *Daśāśvamēdhas* or ten horse-sacrifices. The Pallavas whom Mādhavavarman had conquered were also found boasting their family of the *Aśvamēdhas* they had performed. Naturally Mādhavavarman thought it worthwhile to emulate them all. Why should he not perform more sacrifices to enhance the prestige of his own and of his family and of his kingdom ? Besides performing a good number of royal sacrifices including eleven *Aśvamēdhas* etc., Mādhavavarman II assumed also a few titles to mark off his own glory. The nature and the significance of these sacrifices and titles and their connected problems may be studied separately (Appendix III).

Before concluding it may be observed that there is practically no clue to decide as to what could have been the dates and significance of Mādhavavarman's performance of those sacrifices. However, because the list of the sacrifices, stated to have been performed by him is an unusually long one, it may be presumed that Mādhavavarman must have started, even in the early part of his reign, performing some sacrifices, including one or more *Aśvamēdhas*, when he finally threw off the Vākāṭaka

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

yoke ; and that he repeated the same when he conquered and annexed the regions of Vēṅgī, Pishṭapura, Guṇṭūr etc. Again, it is also likely that these sacrifices point not only to his deep devotion to the Vēdic religion, but also to his success against his neighbours, including the Vākāṭakas of Vatsagulma to whom the Vishṇukuṇḍi owed allegiance. The Velpuru record is silent on these sacrifices, not because Mādhavavarman had not performed any of them, but because the author of the text of that record, on the one reason or the other, did not choose to refer to them.

(ii) FAMILY OF MĀDHAVAVARMAN II

Mādhavavarman had atleast two queens. One of them, the mother of Dēvavarman, as we have already suggested,[81] was probably a princess of the Rāshṭrakūṭa family of Mānapura and was perhaps a daughter of Dēvarāja of that family. Mādhavavarman's another queen was a Vākāṭaka princess, as we learn from the records of his successors.

There is some difference of opinion regarding the identity of the family to which this queen belonged. Some writers believe that she must have been a daughter[85] or a grand-daughter[86] of Harishēṇa of the Vatsagulma branch of the Vākāṭakas. But the Vishṇukuṇḍi chronology, accepted here, militates against this view. According to another school of thought, this queen might have been a daughter of Dēvasēna, if not his sister.[87] But it has already been shown how during the period of Pravarasēna II of the main branch, the influence of that line over the Vishṇukuṇḍi rulers superceded that of the Vatsagulma line of kings,[88] and how the Vishṇukuṇḍis along with the Rāshṭrakūṭas of Mānapura made a common cause against the Vastsagulma rulers.[89] Moreover, the Vishṇukuṇḍis boast themselves of their Vākāṭaka blood-relationship and it probably indicates some material advantage they might have received from the Vākāṭakas at the time of their rise and expansion. But, at the same time, Harishēṇa of the Vatsagulma line is known to have taken a punitive expedition against the ruler of Andhra, *viz.*, the Vishṇukuṇḍi.[90] Therefore it is likely that it was the Vākāṭaka of the main branch from whom the Vishṇukuṇḍi got such a help. Besides, the conversion of Gōvindavarman from Buddhism to Śaivism, as we saw earlier, was perhaps due to his contact with Pravarasēna II of the main line of the Vākāṭakas.[91] Therefore Dubreuil seems to be quite correct in suggesting that Mādhavavarman's queen must have been a daughter or grand-daughter of queen Prabhāvatīguptā.[92]

In support of the above suggestion of the Vishṇukuṇḍi's relationship with the Vākāṭakas of the main line the following may also be added. There is a place called Chandraguptapaṭṇa[93] on the northern bank of the Kṛishnā in the area that was included in the Vishṇukuṇḍi kingdom. Though the antiquity of this geographical name is difficult to ascertain, one may be apt to feel that there must have been some Gupta influence in naming the place after Chandragupta. Secondly, Mādhavavarman's son through the Vākāṭaka princess bore the name Vikramēndravarman—a name which was introduced for the first time in the Vishṇukuṇḍi family. Though the name Indravarman was already known in the dynasty, the addition of *Vikrama* to that name was most probably due to the influence of the name of the Gupta emperor Chandragupta II *Vikramāditya*. For, *Vikrama*, we know, is the abbreviated form of *Vikramāditya*,[94] and hundreds of Chandragupta's coins bear the legend *śrī-Vikramaḥ*.[95] This influence one may have to trace possibly through the queen Prabhāvatīguptā, who was the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

daughter of that great Gupta emperor, was the queen of Rudrasēna and was the mother of Pravarasēna II.

Some scholars believe that Mādhavavarman's title *Trivaranagara-bhavana-gata-yuvati-hṛidaya-nandana* is suggestive of the king's marriage with a princess of the family of Mahāśivagupta Tīvaradēva of South Kōsala.[96] At the same time there is another school of thought that takes this title as an indication of Mādhavavarman's conquest of the South Kōsala ruler or of his city.[97] Reserving a detailed examination of this title to a future occasion,[98] it may be pointed here that the place Trivaranagara of the title was the Vishṇukuṇḍi capital of the time and it had nothing to do with Tīvara the king of South Kosala.

Mādhavavarman II is known to have had at least three sons, *viz.*, Dēvavarman, Vikramēndravarman I and Mañchyaṇṇabhaṭṭāraka. Scholars generally take Dēvavarman to be the eldest of the three.[99] The Ipur set II is the only source of information about this prince. Besides endowing him with no royal title like *Mahārāja* or *Rājan*, the said charter describes him as a warrior of renowned valour shown in annihilating the *kshatriyas*.[100] On that account it is usually believed that this prince fell in one of the battles of the wars waged by his father and predeceased him.[101] Vikramēndravarman I, born of the Vākāṭaka princess succeeded his father to the throne and we shall study the history of his reign in datail later. The prince Mañchyaṇṇabhaṭṭāraka is known only as the *ājña* or the executor of the Ipur set I of his father. Again his name does not figure in the list of the Vishṇukuṇḍi kings given by the charters of the family. So it may be concluded that he did not rule at all, independently atleast. It is interesting to note that the name of this prince furnishes the solitary instance of a Telugu name among the Vishṇukuṇḍi princess whose names are otherwise Sanskritic.

Yet another Vishṇukuṇḍi prince designated as *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja* figures in the Velpuru record of Mādhavavarman II and we have suggested a probable identification of this prince with Guṇabhartṛi, the *ājñā* of the Ipur set II. There is nothing to indicate his relationship with Mādhavavarman II. Yet it may not be far from right if this prince is taken to be yet another son, or more probably another grandson of that monarch. There is nothing to help us to decide the identity of the mother or mothers of both Mañchyaṇṇabhaṭṭāraka and this *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja*.[102]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. No. VIII, lines 19-20.
2. See *e.g.* the *Vishṇu. Khaṇḍa* III, Ch. 95, verses 14, 18, 21, 31 and 82.
3. EI, XVII, pp. 334-35.
4. See below.
5. Cf. SS, p. 130 ; ED, p. 525.
6. This place may not be very far from the said gift village.
7. EI, XVII, p. 335.
8. See Appendix IV.
9. E.g. The Uṇḍivāṭikā grant of Abhimanyu (EI, VIII, pl. between pp. 164-65) and the Pāṇḍaraṅgapalli grant of Avidhēya (EI, XXXVII, pl. between pp. 20-21).
10. See the notes under the text of the charter.
11. EI, XXVII, p. 316. See also *JBBRAS* (*NS*) IV, p. 89.
12. See above Ch. III, sect. iv.
13. See below note 39 and Ch. V, sect. ii.
14. See below Ch. V. sect. ii; Ch. VI, sect. i.
15. CII, II, pt. i, pp. lxxx, 163.
16. CA, p. 216. As we have already seen in the first chapter that the arguments basing on the titles *Trivaranagara* etc., and *Hiraṇyagarbha-prasūta* may not carry much weight.
17. JDL, XI, pp. 44-45 ; EI, XXIII, pp. 91-92 ; IC, XV, p. 19 ; CA, p. 225.
18. JBBRAS (NS), IV, p. 89.
19. ABORI, XXV, 1944, p. 46.
20. EI, XXVII, pp. 314-15.
21. Ibid., p. 315, n. 10 ; CA, p. 210, n. 1.
22. EI, XXVII, p. 315, n. 10.
23. EI, XXXVI, p. 9, n. 9 ; p. 10, n. 2.
24. Ibid.
25. Thus the record may be of a Rāshṭrakūṭa king even though Mādhavavarman mentioned therein was a Vishṇukuṇḍi.
26. EI, XXVII, p. 315. See Appendix V.
27. E.g. the Mallam (Nellur District) inscription of the reign of Nandivarman Pallava malla records a gift made as ordered by a Chālukya king *i.e.* Vikramāditya II (see CA, pp. 281-82) and the Kanchipuram (Chingleput District) inscription dated in the regnal year of Rājarāja Chōḷa III records a gift made by the Eastern Gaṅga Anaṅgabhīma III (EI, XXXI, pp. 97, 99 ff.), though the regions of Mallam and Kāñchīpuram did not form parts of the kingdoms of the said Chālukya and the Eastern Gaṅga kings respectively. It may also be pointed out that at Śrīraṅgam, Kāñchī (both within the Chōḷa empire) and Drākshārāma (in the Kākatīya kingdom) there are inscriptions dated in the regnal years of the kings of other dynasties also who did not rule over those areas. See ibid., pp. 96, 100 ff.
28. EI, XXXVII, p. 1 ff.
29. CII, V, p. 108, verses 11 and 16.
30. See APGAS, No. 10.
31. JDL, XI, p. 56.
32. Some believe that the Sālaṅkāyanas ruled upto 475 A.D. See JIH, XL, p. 565.
33. See e.g. *Āśvalāyana Gṛihyasūtra*, Ch. 3, *Khaṇḍa* 9, *Sūtra* 16 ; *Agni.* Ch. 269, verses 35-37.
34. Cf. MB. *Udyōga.* Ch. 149, verse 57.
35. See the *Vishṇudh. Khaṇḍa* II, Ch. 176, verse 2.
36. See e.g. *Kathā., Taraṅga* 20, verses 96-100, and the *Bṛihatkathāmañjarī, Lambaka* III, verses 341, 365-70 where the god Śiva Himself is depicted to advise Indra to worship Gaṇēśa before starting on a war. See also EI, XXXVII. p. 127, n.
37. Cf. No. VIII, lines 7-8.
38. See below sect. iii.
39. The identification of this prince with Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman suggested elsewhere (EI, XXXVII, p. 128) may not stand scrutiny.
40. AIU, pp. 224-26.
41. See CA, pp. 203-04. See below Ch. VII, sect. iii.
42. Even the two sets of the Kanteru plates of the Sālaṅkāyana kings (JAHRS, V, pp. 21 ff), though found near Guntur do not show any Sālaṅkāyana occupation of the area as believed by some (ibid. XXIX, pts. 1 & 2, p. 76). For, both the sets record the grant of villages that are located in the Bandar and Kaikaluru Taluks of the Krishna District (ibid. V, pp. 25-26 ; ED, p. 379).
43. See Ch. VI, sect. i.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

44. IA, V, pp. 154 ff.
45. See CA, p. 283; KESIH, p. 33.
46. EI, VIII, pp. 233 ff.
47. See A. Soc. SI., Silver Jubilee Volume pp. 76-77 for an analysis of the early Pallava charters.
48. Some would take the Velpuru inscription as indicative of an invasion by Mādhavavarman to reconquer the area from Kandara of the Chezerla inscription. See also APGAS, No. 10, pp. 14-15. But see below Ch. VIII, sect. iii, for reasons to believe that the said Kandara of that record is to be assigned to date sometime after Mādhavavarman III and before Vikramēndravarman II.
49. See CA, p. 279. See also the Ongodu plates (II) of Skandavarman II (EI, XV, pp. 251 ff., lines 1-2).
50. Cf. ibid. line 3.
51. Cf. ibid. line 4; the Uruvapalli plates of *Yuvarāja* Vishṇugōpa (IA, V, 50 ff, line 5).
52. See Ch. V, sect. ii.
53. See AIU, p. 205 ; VIJ, V, p. 83.
54. CA, pp. 211-12.
55. CA, pp. 212-13.
56. See Ch. VII, sect. ii and iii.
57. The recently discovered Pauni plates of Pravarasēna II are dated in his 32nd year. See EI, XXXVIII, pp. 53 ff.
58. See EHD, pp. 183 ff. The intended reading of the defectively worded title of Narēndrasēna, under consideration, seems to be *Pūrv-ādhigata-guṇa-viśvāyām da(u)pahṛita-vaṁśa-Śriyaḥ* (CII, V, plate facing p. 81, lines 26-27) meaning "one to whom the family fortunes are brought in this earth that has already known (his) virtues". [The *vigraha* of *upahṛita* etc., being *upahṛitāḥ vaṁśa-Śriyaḥ yasmai tasya*. For a confusion between *u* and *da* in another Vākāṭaka record, see ibid., plate facing p. 96, line 5]. The above reading requires less correction than the one usually accepted (See EI, IX, p. 270 ; CII V, p. 81 ; Jayaswal, *Hist. of India*, p. 100 ; EHD, p. 182, n.) and justifies the final *m* of *viśvāyām*. Again the above reading obviously goes against the remark that the Vākāṭaka records give the entire credit for restoring the fortunes of the family to Narēndrasēna (EHD, p. 183). According to some, Narēndrasēna's enemies were the Nalas (ibid.) who are regarded as enemies of Pṛithivīshēṇa II by others (CA, p. 184). However the Nalas seem to have penetrated into the Vākāṭaka region only in the subsequent period. See below Ch. V, sect. iii.
59. Cf. EHD, p. 182 ff.
60. Cf. *dvimagna-vaṁśasy=ōddhartṛi* (Balaghat plates, line 33), 'twice retrieved the fallen fortunes of his family'. Kielhorn's correction of *dvimagna* into *nimagna* (EI, IX p. 271, n. 15) though still followed by a few (CII, V, p. 81), is not generally accepted by scholars. See CA, 184 ; EHD, p. 184.
61. EHD, pp. 184-85.
62. SS, p. 133. See also below Ch. V. sect. ii.
63. CA, p. 184.
64. See below Ch. V.
65. IHC, XI, p. 49.
66. For the theory assigning Mādhavavarman's rule to 510 A.D., so as to explain the supposed occupation of Vidarbha by that Vishṇukuṇḍi king after Harishēṇa, see JNSI, XXVIII, p. 169. But the chronological difficulties that confront that theory are quite apparent.
67. See CII, V, p. xxxiii.
68. CA, pp. 217 ff.
69. Ibid., p, 184.
70. Cf. SS, p. 129 ; EI, XXIII, pp. 91–92 ; CA, pp. 208, 220 ; and Appendix V.
71. EI, XXI, pp. 289 ff.
72. Ibid., p. 290 ; ibid. XXXVII, p. 17.
73. EI, XXXVII, pp. 20 ff.
74. EI, VIII, pp. 163 ff.
75. This period for these rulers is further supported by the possibility of the identity of Jayasiṁha figuring as a commander of a fort in the charter of the said Abhimanyu with the Chālukya Jayasiṁha-vallabha, the grandfather of Pulakēśi I (535-66 A.D.). See AHD, p. 111 ; CA, p. 229.
76. Cf. the Pāṇḍaraṅgapalli grant (EI, XXXVII, p. 20) verse 1.
77. For the opposite views on the identification of Vidarbha and Aśmaka see CA, p. 200 ; SG, p. 157 ff., on one hand and CII, V, p. xxx ; EI, XXXVII, p. 18, on the other. The dynastic appellation *Rāshṭrkūṭa* of the Mānapura kings show that they had been originally provincial governors or feudatories of some kings (CA, p. 200 ; SG, p. 152) to be identified with the Vākāṭakas of the age.
78. See Ch. V, sect. iii.
79. AHD, p. 92. See also above Ch. III, sect. ii.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

80. CA, 184 ; EHD, p. 183. However, if one is to take Ajjhitabhaṭṭārikā as a Rāshṭrakūṭa princess of Mānapura (CII, V, p. xxv) then it may be suggested that the political and marital ties of the Vishṇukuṇḍis with the Rāshṭrakūṭas was further strengthened by the marriage of the Rāshṭrakūṭa princess with Narēndrasēna, the brother-in-law of Mādhavavarman.
81. SG, pp. 13 ff.
82. Cf. No. VIII, lines 8-9 and 19.
83. After the Sātavahana kings, like Sātakarṇi I and Vasishṭhīputra Puḷumāvi (see ASWI, V, pp. 60 ff. line 2 ; EI, VIII, p. 60, line 3 ; etc.) probably Mādhavavarman II was the first king to have such a claim. Therefore, it may not be a mere conventional exaggeration. However, it must be pointed that there is nothing to support the view that by dynastic marriages "the Vākāṭakas, Vishṇukuṇḍis, Kadambas and Guptas formed a combined bulwark against the continuous inroads of the barbarian Hūṇas" (ED, p. 457). Again there is also nothing to show that either the Vākāṭaka, or the Vishṇukuṇḍi or the Kadamba had ever fought with the Hūṇas.
84. See above sect. ii.
85. CII, V. p. xxxiii ; QJMS, XXX, p. 309 n., p. 316.
86. EHD, p. 188.
87. CA, p. 224. Some scholars feel that her father cannot be identified at present. See EI, XXXVI, p. 9.
88. Above Ch. III, sect. iii and iv.
89. See above sect. ii.
90. See above Ch. III, note 62.
91. See above Ch. III, sect. ii.
92. AHD, p. 74.
93. ASSI, I, p. 7. It is also interesting to note that the *Śrīśailamāhātmya* also associates the princes Chandrāvatī (*i.e.* Prabhāvatīguptā) with this Chandraguptapaṭṇam. See N. Ramesan, *Temples and Legends of Andhra Pradesh* (Bombay, 1962) p. 13.
94. CII, III, Introd. p. 18.
95. See Altekar, *Cat. Gupta Coins in the Bayana Hoard.*, Bombay, 1954, pp. 68-164.
96. JDL, XI, p. 39.
97. QJMS, XXX, p. 314 ; CA, p. 208.
98. See Appendix III.
99. SS, p. 107 ; CA, p. 224.
100. No. V, lines 4-5.
101. SS, p. 106, EHAC, p. 205 ; CA, p. 224. For a different view see ED, pp. 460 ff.
102. There are several legends describing Mādhavavarman as a righteous ruler and as a conqueror (JDL, XI, pp. 55 ff., CA, p. 209) though it is difficult to be sure whether they refer to the second or the fourth Vishṇukuṇḍi king of that name.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CHAPTER V

SETBACK AND RECOVERY

(i) VIKRAMĒNDRAVARMAN I

The highest known regnal year of Mādhavavarman II is 37. So, we may assume that he ruled for about 40 years and his reign probably ended in c. 502 A.D. He was succeeded to the throne by his son Vikramēndravarman, also called Vikramēndrabhaṭṭārakavarman.[1]

No charter issued by this prince has come to light so far. Further, in the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham charters no regal title is prefixed to his name. On these grounds scholars once thought that just like his brothers, Vikramēndravarman too never ruled.[2] But from the fact that the Tummalagudem (II) and the Kendulapalem charters prefix the royal title *Mahārāja* to the name of this Vikramēndravarman, it may be concluded that Vikramēndravarman did rule and his reign might have started sometime about 502 A.D. Some scholars are of the opinion that Vikramendravarman ruled for about five or ten years[3] while others assign to him only two years of rule.[4] However, because the reign of Mādhavavarman II seems to have ended sometime in 502 A.D. and that of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman commenced in 526-27 A.D., it is likely that Vikramēndravarman I ruled about 25 years in between them.

Though no charter of Vikramēndravarman I himself has come to light, all the records of his successors including the Polamuru set I speak of him. The reasons for the identification of Vikramahēndravarman of the Polamuru charter with this Vikramēndravarman I have already been studied.[5] In this connection the following may also be added. In the Polamuru set I Gōvindavarman II and his son Mādhavavarman IV are endowed with the *birudas Vikramāśraya* and *Janāśraya* respectively. Therefore it is reasonable to expect a similar *biruda* for Vikramēndravarman also in that record, in case he had any. But the absence of any such title may suggest that Vikramēndravarman of the Polamuru set I must be different from *Uttamāśraya* Vikramēndravarman II and identical with Vikramēndravarman I. For, the latter is not known to have had any such title, and there was no third king of that name known in the family.

Vikramēndravarman's titles, *viz.*, *pratap-ōpanata-sakala-sāmanta-makuṭa-mañjarī-piñjarita-charaṇa-yugala*[6] together with his description as a king of irresistible sway, prowess, might, etc.,[7] go against the view, once held by scholars, that Vikramēndravarman I had no other merit than that of his birth.[8] He also bore the epithet *ubhaya-vaṁś-ālaṅkārabhūta*[9] which reminds one of *ubhaya-kul-ālaṅkārabhūtā*,[10] a title borne by Prabhāvatīguptā who was perhaps his great-grandmother on his mother's side.[11] Besides, in one record he is endowed with the title *mahākavi* (great poet).[12] Though no poetic work of his is known to be extant now, the above epithet probably indicates that he had in him some poetic talents inherited from his maternal grandfather Pravarasēna II, the reputed author of the *Sētubandha*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

otherwise known as *Rāvaṇavaho*.[13] While a majority of the records of the family are silent about Vikramēndravarman's religion, in one instance he is described as the meditator on the feet of the Lord of the Śrīparvata.[14] But, in another case he is described as a devotee of Sugata, *i.e.*, the Buddha.[15] This may indicate that, just like his paternal grandfather (*viz.*, Gōvindavarman I), he too was well disposed towards both Hinduism and Buddhism and encouraged both the religions.

But one thing must be admitted. All the epithets of this king are very general in nature and none of them credits him with any particular political achievement. This fact, if viewed along with the total absence of his records, may suggest that there was perhaps an eclipse of Vishṇukuṇḍi power during the period of Vikramēndravarman I. In the Ajanta cave inscription the Vākāṭaka king Harishēṇa of the Vatsagulma branch is described as a conqueror of the powerful rulers of Andhra, Kuntala, Avantī, etc.[16] We have already traced the circumstances under which the Vishṇukuṇḍis, though originally feudatories of the Vākāṭaka rulers of Vatsagulma,[17] came subsequently under the influence of the rulers of the main branch of the Vākāṭaka family, joined with the Rāshṭrakūṭas of Mānapura, rebelled against the overlords and declared independence during the weak rule of Dēvasēna in Vatsagulma.[18] So there is no wonder if Harishēṇa (475-510 A.D.), the powerful son and successor of Dēvasēna chalked out a plan of punitive wars against the rebels and was successful in carrying out that plan. As there is no proof to the contrary, one may take the above claim of Harishēṇa at its face value.

The date of the Vākāṭaka expedition cannot be determined at present. It might have happened either about the end of the reign of Mādhavavarman II or more probably in the beginning of the reign of Vikramēndravarman I, who was perhaps not strong enough to meet the crisis. It was during this period that Mādhavavarman III of the collateral branch and *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja* Guṇabhartṛi joined together and invaded the Vēṅgī country.[19] Again, taking advantage of the weakness and confusion at the centre, the feudatories like the Pṛithivīmūlas, the Gaṅgas etc. too became independent.[20] An epithet of Vikramēndravarman I probably indicates that he tried hard to put down the rebellious chiefs.[21] Thus the reign of Vikramēndravarman I, the son and successor of the mighty Mādhavavarman II, seems to have been a period of weakness in the central authority and of foreign aggression resulting in the internal strife and civil war.

(ii) MĀDHAVAVARMAN III

Mādhavavarman III was the son of Dēvavarman. The following charter is the only available source of information regarding this prince.

The Ipur Plates (Set II) : The engraving of this charter is bold, but very shallow. Hence, in many places the letters are worn out and lost. We have already suggested that the characters of this charter could have been later than those of the Ipur set I. The present charter was issued from Kudūrapura by Mādhavavarman III described as the son of Dēvavarman and grandson of *Mahārāja* Mādhavavarman, who was the performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and the *Agnishṭōmasahasra*. Mādhavavarman III is also credited with the title *Trikūṭa-Malay-ādhipati*. The formal portion of the charter is very much damaged. Yet, there is no doubt that it records the royal gift of the village Murōdyakaḷuki to two Brāhmaṇas named Agniśarman and Indraśarman. A certain Guṇabhartṛi designated as *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja* acted as the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

executor of the grant. The record is dated in the 7th day of the 7th fortnight of the rainy season of the 47th regnal year, evidently of Mādhavavarman III, who issued the charter.

We have already shown that Dēvavarman and his son Mādhavavarman, the issuer of the present charter, formed a collateral branch of the Vishṇukuṇḍi family. The name of the place from which this charter was issued is usually read as Amarapura.[22] Some have proposed to identify this Amarapura with the modern Amarāvatī on the bank of the Kṛishṇā,[23] and this identification has been endorsed by others also.[24] However, this identification has been rightly questioned on the ground that Amarāvatī was known only by the name Dhānyakaṭaka till as late as the 6th-7th century and it was never called as Amarapura.[25] In fact, the facsimiles and the impressions of the record show that the reading of the name of the place under question is possibly Kudūrapura only. This place was obviously no other than that Kudūranagara where from Jayavarman of the Bṛihatphalāyana family issued his Kondamudi plates.[26] Dubreuil has correctly identified that place with the modern village Kūḍūru or Gūḍūru four miles west-north-west of Masūlipaṭṇam.[27] The grant village Murōdyakaḷuki cannot be satisfactorily identified.[28] It has been suggested by some writers that the donee Agniśarman of the record may be identified with his namesake who figures as the donee in the Ipur set I.[29] However, as we shall see subsequently, the present record was issued about 40 years after the Ipur set I.[30] So, it is more probable that, if at all the donees of these two charters were related to one another, the donee Agniśarman of the Ipur set II, might have been the grandson of his namesake, the donee of the Ipur set I.

The sentence mentioning the executor of the grant is believed to read as *asya śāsanasy=ājñā Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja-dhyān-ōdāttā* and it is taken to mean "The command (*ājñā*) of this edict was ennobled by the meditation of the overlord of the Vishṇukuṇḍis".[31] But it may be pointed out that the passage so read and interpreted does not suit the context ; and that a sentence of such or similar type, with such or similar import, is not met with anywhere else in epigraphs. A scholar was inclined to read *Vishṇukuṇḍy-Adhirāja-Guṇavantau* in the portion under question and he viewed it to contain a reference to two executors of the grant namely Adhirāja and Guṇavanta supposed to be two princes of the Vishṇukuṇḍi family.[32] But Adhirāja as a personal name sounds rather unusual. In fact, with reasonable certainty the passage under question can be read as *asya śāsanasy=ājñā Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja-Guṇabharttā*. So, the *ājñā* or the executor of the grant was one Guṇabhartṛi designated as *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja*, evidently meaning 'a prince of Vishṇukuṇḍi family.'[33]

The first symbol in the date portion denoting the year is damaged. So there has been some difference of opinion among the scholars regarding the date of the grant. Dr. Hultzsch read it as [*4*]7 doubtfully while others have attempted to read the year of the record, as *17*[31] or *27*[35] mainly with a view to accommodate the rule of the issuer of the charter in between Mādhavavarman II and his son Vikramēndravarman. However, it must be accepted that the reading 47 (not 17 or 27) is much nearer to the original.[36] So, these scholars have assumed subsequently (obviously to avoid the above chronological difficulty) that the year 47 was not of the donor of the record but of his grandfather Mādhavavarman.[37] In support of this theory it has been argued that Mādhavavarman, the donor is not endowed with any regal title

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

and that the passage read as *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja-dhyān-ōdāttā* in connection with the *ājñā* of the record cannot but indicate that the charter was issued at the command of the *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja* 'Vishṇukuṇḍi overlord', identical with Mādhavavarman, the grandfather of the donor.[38]

But we have taken Mādhavavarman III to belong to the collateral line and hence there is no difficulty in accommodating his long rule. The absence of royal titles in his case cannot decide the issue as there are similar instance even in the case of ruling kings,[39] like Mādhavavarman II in the Velpuru record. Further Mādhavavarman III started his career as a governor under his grandfather and perhaps turned to be a vassal of Harishēṇa subsequently. The untenability of the reading *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja-dhyān-ōdāttā* has already been seen.[40] Therefore there appears to be no valid reason against taking the year 47, cited, as that of the donor himself (*i.e.* Mādhavavarman III) as in the case of the respective years of all the other records of the family.

Let us now see the part played by Mādhavavarman III in the history of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. He is endowed in his charter with the title *Trikūṭa-Malay-ādhipati*. The circumstances under which Mādhavavarman II might have helped the Vākāṭaka Narēndrasēna against the Traikūṭakas or the rulers of the Trikūṭa had already been traced.[41] The above title may indicate that as a viceroy or commander of his grandfather's army, Mādhavavarman III probably joined the Vākāṭaka in their expedition against that foe. His conquest of the Malaya too was perhaps connected with that expedition or more probably with his conquest of the eastern coast of the Vēṅgī country.[42] In this connection, the following points are also worth considering. The Ānanda king Kandara II a later contemporary of Mādhavavarman, is also known to have had the title *Trikūṭaparvatapati*. But none of the early rulers of the Ānanda family is known to have borne that title. The Ānandas, though once independent, had been reduced to vassalage subsequently by the powerful Pallavas,[43] probably from whom the Vishṇukuṇḍi Mādhavavarman II brought under his rule the region of Sāttanapalle- Narasaraopet, the home of the Ānandas.[44] All these facts tend to indicate that Mādhavavarman III was probably appointed by his grandfather as a governor of the newly conquered territory, and that the Ānanda subsequently drove the Vishṇukuṇḍi out of his country and appropriated the title for himself.[45] Again, the fact that no other Vishṇukuṇḍi king of the main line had a similar title seems to suggest that Mādhavavarman III and Kandara II might have ruled over one and the same territory, obviously the latter after the former ; and that the rulers of the main branch, had no hold on that territory.

As the Velpuru inscription is dated in the 33rd year of Mādhavavarman II, we may believe that round about that year the Kandara country was conquered and Mādhavavarman III was appointed as a governor of it. But the place of issue of the charter of Mādhavavarman III would show that by the date of the Ipur set II he was in possession of the Masūlipaṭṇam region. Similarly his claim to be the lord of Malaya also perhaps indicates that he probably conquered the Malayāvani territory adjacent to the above region.[46] Moreover, as we shall see latter, his cousin brother Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman is credited with the success in driving out his *dāyādas* or kinsmen obviously from his kingdom.[47] These may make it clear that though Mādhavavarman III remained as a provincial governor of the Kandarapura region

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

(*i.e.* the Ānanda territory)[48] under his grandfather, he became independent after the latter's death ; and that taking advantage of the weakness of Vikramēndravarman I in the centre and the confusion that followed the Vākāṭaka Haṛishēṇa's expedition in Andhra, he might have invaded and occupied the coastal part of Andhra from where he was driven out later by Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman.

In this connection one more point deserves our attention. As we saw earlier the Ajanta inscription of Varāhadēva credits the Vākāṭaka king Harishēṇa with the conquest of some mountains and countries, the list of which is unfortunately not fully preserved.[49] Though one may not be sure whether that list originally included the Malaya, there is no doubt that the extant part of the list includes the Trikūṭa and Andhra. It is not unlikely that Mādhavavarman III joined Harishēṇa's expedition to the Trikūṭa and also probably the Malaya and assumed the title *Trikūṭa-Malay-ādhipati* to commemorate his success there. In that case the invasion and occupation of the Masūlipaṭṇam area of the Andhra country by Mādhavavarman III was only a part of a bigger military move of the Vākāṭaka. Probably Mādhavavarman III revived the traditional Vishṇukuṇḍi policy of recognizing the suzerainty of the Vākāṭakas of Vatsagulma. His action was no doubt amply rewarded by the Vākāṭaka emperor who allowed him to rule over the occupied part of the Andhra country. The absence of regal titles in his description in the Ipur charter II, if it is significant, perhaps indicates a sort of his feudal status he had had under the Vākāṭakas.[50]

Mādhavavarman's original principality was probably the same Kandarapura-vara-janapada perhaps to be identified with the region around the modern Chēzerla in the Narasaraopet Taluk. To the north of the region was the Vēlpūrudēśa or the province of Vēlpūru (*i.e.*, roughly the modern Sattenapalle Taluk) of which his brother or cousin brother or uncle, the *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja* Guṇabhartṛi was the governor. In the conquest of the main land of Andhra, Mādhavavarman III appears to have got the support and co-operation of that prince also, as evidenced by the Ipur set II.

Did Mādhavavarman conquer and occupy the whole of the Central Andhra, or only a part of it ? When did he occupy that territory ? How long did he continue to occupy it ? All these questions cannot have precise answers. However the inscriptions of the rulers of the main branch do not indicate any break in the rule of their line. Hence it is likely that Vikramēndravarman I and his son were also ruling over some part, *i.e.*, the western part of the main land of Andhra country even during the period of Mādhavavarman's occupation of the same. Coming to the next question it may be noted that the 47th regnal year of Mādhavavarman III in which the Ipur set II is dated, perhaps corresponded to the 15th year of the reign of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman who started ruling c. 526 A.D.[51] Therefore the date of the Ipur set II may be c. 526+15=541 A.D. So, Mādhavavarman III must have occupied the Masūlipaṭṇam area earlier than that date. In case in his adventure Mādhavavarman III got the help of Harishēṇa, as has been earlier suggested, then it is likely that he occupied that region earlier than c. 510 A.D. the last date accepted for that mighty Vākāṭaka conqueror.[52] If so, the answer to the third question would naturally be that he was occupying the area for about 31 years till c. 541 A.D. (541 *minus* 510). At any rate it is certain that he could not have continued to occupy the area

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

much longer. For, soon after the date of the Ipur set II, as we have already seen and also shall see later, Vikramēndravarman's son Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman succeeded in driving out of his territory his *dāyādas, i.e.*, Mādhavavarman III and his co-adjutor Guṇabhartṛi.

It is not known whether the last mentioned two princes had sons, and whether they continued to rule over the principality of Kandarapuravara-janapada etc., for some time more. The theory that Harishēṇa helped a son of Mādhavavarman III against Vikramēndravarman I and slew the latter[53] may not hold good on account of its manifest chronological difficulties. The circumstances indicate that soon afterwards the Ānanda power started to assert itself under Kandara II once again in the area perhaps with the assistance of the Pallavas.[51] Thus the province of Kandarapuravara-janapada, seems to have been lost by the Vishṇukuṇḍis. The same might have been the case with the Vēlpūrudēśa also, the province governed perhaps by Guṇabhartṛi.

Some writers have built up the following thesis.[55] At the time of the death of his grandfather, Mādhavavarman III was too young to take the throne. Hence his uncle Vikramēndravarman I became the king. Mādhavavarman, when he came of age, fought with his cousin Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman in an attempt to get the kingdom into his own hand and the quarrel ended in a compromise. Consequently Mādhavavarman, the lord of the Trikūṭa-Malaya and the issuer of the Ipur set II, was allowed to rule over a part of the western mountainous region of the kingdom from "Amarapura" owing a nominal allegiance to Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. As against this thesis we have already seen that even during the time of his grandfather, Mādhavavarman III was old enough to be appointed as a viceroy or governor and to take part in the wars fought by Mādhavavarman, the elder. Again, the Ipur set II was issued not from Amarapura in the western part of the kingdom, but from Kudūrapura in the eastern part. Lastly, the above thesis would drive one to presume that the reign period of Mādhavavarman III started after the alleged compromise or a little earlier. Then it would naturally follow that his 47th regnal year, in which the Ipur set II was issued, fell sometimes after the date of the Ramatirtham plates. It is needless to point out that to take such a position may hardly be justified by the palaeography of the letters of those two charters.

(iii) INDRABHAṬṬĀRAKAVARMAN

The son and successor of Vikramēndravarman I was Indravarman II, invariably referred to as Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman in the grant of his successor. The following is the only one record of this king that has come to us.

The Ramatirtham Plates: This charter was issued by the king Indravarman from his camp at what is called Puranisaṅgama. Here the king styles himself as *Rājan* and as the son of *Rājan* Vikramēndravarman, who was the son of *Mahārāja* Mādhavavarman, the performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and the *Kratusahasra*. The formal part of the grant records the royal gift of the village Peruvāṭaka, also called Peruvāḍaka, situated in the Pḷakirāshṭra, in favour of a Brāhmaṇa, by name Nagnaśarman, belonging to the Māṇḍīra *gōtra* and the Taittirīya *śākhā*. The king himself was the executor of the grant. The record is dated in the seventh lunar day of the bright fortnight of the month Jyēshṭha, in the 27th regnal year of the king.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

The territorial division Pḷakirāshṭra in which the gift village was included has been identified with the region of the modern Srikakulam District.[56] Sometimes it is also called as Pḷaki-vishaya or Paḷakki-vishaya[57] in other inscriptions. Probably this division had its headquarters at the modern Pakki (18° 35′ N. 83° 25′E.) in the Bobbili Taluk, Srikakulam District.[58] Similarly the gift village Peruvāṭaka or Peruvāḍaka may be tentatively identified with the modern village Perumāli (18° 25′ N., 83° 30′ E.) in the same Taluk, only about 10 miles to the south-east of Pakki and about 20 miles to the north of Rāmatīrtham, the findspot of the record. Regarding the place of issue of the charter, some scholars like H. Krishna Sastri and Hultzsch have taken the whole expression *Puranisaṅgama* as a single unit.[59] But K.R. Subramanian took it as consisting of two units, *viz.*, *Purani* and *Saṅgama*,[60] and Dr. Sircar interpreted it as "the confluence of the river Purani".[61] But, both Puranisaṅgama and the river Purani still remain to be identified.[62] However, it is reasonable to think that the above expression contains two units, *i.e.*, *Pura* and *Nisaṅgama* signifying 'a town named Nisaṅgama'.[63] In that case the place Nisaṅgama may be identified with the modern Saṅgam (18° 35′ N., 83° 35′E.) in the Palkonda Taluk of the Srikakulam District. It is on the confluence of the Suvarṇamukhī and the Nāgāvalī rivers and is about four miles to the east of Pakki and 12 miles to the north-east of Perumāli mentioned above.

Now let us turn to the political history of the reign of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. From his time onwards our study of the history of the dynasty is based on much surer chronology, thanks to the recent discovery of some valuable epigraphs. The year 555 A.D. is fixed as the lower limit of his reign by the Tummalagudem set II. The epigraphs tell us that his first son Vikramēndravarman II was still a boy when he was enthroned by the council of ministers.[64] Therefore it is reasonable to conclude that Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman was not very much aged at the time of his death and that he did not rule much longer after his 27th year, the date of the Ramatirtham charter. Possibly he ruled for a year or two after that date.[65] Then it would follow that he must have started his reign in c. 526 A.D. (555 *minus* 29=526).

Earlier we have seen how at the time of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's accession a part of his territory was already under the occupation of his aggressive cousin Mādhavavarman III ; and how taking advantage of the weakness of Vikramēndravarman I, some of the feudatories like Pṛithivīmūla and others, managed to throw off the Vishṇukuṇḍi yoke and became independent. Yet, the Vishṇukuṇḍi kingdom was lucky enough to find in Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, a right leader in the right time. Though the internal conditions of the kingdom were far from satisfactory, fortunately for Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, there was no foreign power strong enough to intervene in his home affairs in favour of the rebellious elements. Harishēṇa, the last great Vākāṭaka, who perhaps instigated Mādhavavarman III to occupy the main Andhra country, was no more, and after him the Vākāṭaka power is unheard of. In the south, the days of the Pallava Siṁhavarman who could think of an invasion into the Vishṇukuṇḍi territory, were yet to come.[66] So, with these advantages Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman seems to have tried measures to restore the Vishṇukuṇḍi kingdom to its original glory.

The records of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman himself and of his successor unanimously and conspicuously too credit him with repeated victories in innumerable battles

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

in which elephants dominated. It seems, therefore, that he organised a huge and formidable army of elephants to achieve his objectives. Perhaps to begin with, he turned his attention to curb the rebellious feudatories. The power and strength of his army were so much that having got no strong foreign power to support them, the rebels had no other go but to organise a confederacy among themselves against their adversary. At the head of that confederacy was perhaps Pṛithivīmūla[67] to whose family belonged the great grandmother of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman (*i.e.* the mother of Mādhavavarman II).[68] Pṛithivīmūla's Godavari plates (I) graphically describe how a number of chieftains, evidently in utter panic, joined together with the sole objective of uprooting Indrabhaṭṭāraka. In a pitched battle that followed, one of the confederates, by name Indrādhirāja, seems to have played a very important role. The allies won the battle and the head of the confederacy, *viz.*, Pṛithivīmūla greatly appreciated the heroism of Indrādhirāja,[69] and presumably as a mark of his appreciation, granted at his request, a village to the Brāhmaṇas.

The scholars who have dealt with the Godavari plates (I) entertain difference of opinion regarding the identity of Indrabhaṭṭāraka and Indrādhirāja both mentioned in the record. There is also disagreement concerning who could have been the members of the coalition and what might have been the result of the battle. At the time when Dr.Fleet edited the Godavari set I, only one king of the name Indrabhaṭṭāraka was known and he was an Eastern Chālukya prince, who was the younger son of Kubja Vishṇuvardhana and who succeeded his elder brother Jayasiṁha and ruled for seven days in 663 A.D.[70] or 673 A.D.[71] Naturally, therefore Fleet took Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the Godavari record to be identical with his Eastern Chālukya namesake. However, the discovery of the Chikkulla plates brought to light one more Indrabhaṭṭāraka, *viz.* the Vishṇukuṇḍi, and Prof. Kielhorn, suggested that Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the Godavari plates may better be identified with the Vishṇukuṇḍi of that name.[72] Scholars in general have accepted[73] the above suggestion of Kielhorn, though in some quarters the earlier view of Fleet still lingers on.[74] Now the Tummalagudem set II testifies to the correctness of Kielhorn's theory.[75]

Indrādhirāja of the Godavari set I is usually identified with the one or the other Indravarman of the Eastern Gaṅga family.[76] However, if one takes into consideration the period and the area, to which the Godavari set I belongs, one cannot think of any Indra other than the first known Eastern Gaṅga king Indravarman, who issued the Jirjingi plates of the Gaṅga year 39 (=c. 535 A.D.).[77] Regarding the part played by Indrādhirāja in the battle against Indrabhaṭṭāraka it may be said that there is no evidence in support of the contention that Indrādhirāja placed himself at the head of the coalition and Pṛithivīmūla was his vassal.[78] On the other hand, the Godavari set I itself bears evidence to the fact which seems to be diametrically opposite to the above contention. Evidently it was Pṛithivīmūla, the issuer of the charter who perhaps headed the coalition while Indrādhirāja at whose request the charter was issued was only his ally, or rather a subordinate ally.[79]

What follows as a natural corollary from the above discussion is the date of the Godavari set I and the date of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's ill success in his conflict with Pṛithivīmūla and others. The Gaṅga era is believed to have started in 496 (or c. 496-98 A.D.).[80] Again Indravarman I, the Gaṅga, figures as an independent

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

monarch—as indicated by his epithet *Mahārāja* in his Jirjingi plates of the year 39 of that era, *i.e.*, c. 535 A.D. At the same time that epithet is conspicuous by its absence in the Godavari set I. On the basis of these one may assign the last mentioned charter and the defeat of the Vishṇukuṇḍi king in the conflict recorded in the Godavari plates to a date sometime before 535 A.D. *i.e.*, sometime in the first decade of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's reign.

In the Godavari set I, Indrabaṭṭāraka's elephant is named as Kumuda while that of his opponent as Supratīka. These names are usually taken to suggest that Indrādhirāja, and Indrabhaṭṭāraka must have advanced respectively from the north-east (*i.e.*, Kaliṅga country) and south-west (*i.e.*, Vēṅgī).[81] Similarly Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's epithet which credits him with victories in the *chāturdanta-samaras* is also taken as a reference to the Vishṇukuṇḍi's victory over his foe from the east, *i.e.*, a Gaṅga of Kaliṅga. For, *chāturdanta* is believed to denote Airāvata, the elephant of the east.[82] But in fact *chāturdanta-samara* of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's title seems to mean simply 'a battle of elephants' just like *ghōṭaka-vigraha* (of the Rewa stone inscription of Karṇa of the Kalachuri year 812 or 1061 A.D.)[83] simply signifies 'a battle of horses'.

The third point is in regard to the other members of the coalition. If the time and area to which the Godavari set I belongs are to be taken into consideration, then it may be suggested that the confederacy of all the chiefs (*aśēsha-nṛipati*) probably included the members of the Rāmakāśyapa *gōtra* family and of chiefs like the Pitṛibhaktas, the Māṭharas and Vāsishṭhas also.[84] For, all of them perhaps had been vanquished or made vassals by Mādhavavarman II as we saw earlier. Assigning Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman to a period between 480-515 A.D., some[85] writers would concur with Dubreuil and suggest that among the many kings of the coalition there was perhaps the Vākāṭaka king Harishēṇa too.[86] But this theory is to be dropped in view of the Vishṇukuṇḍi chronology accepted here. For, while Harishēṇa's reign cannot be extended beyond 510 A.D.,[87] Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman could not have ascended the throne earlier than c. 526 A.D., as has been already concluded.[88]

Coming to the fourth and the last point, *viz.*, the result of the battle, there is no denying that the confederates were victorious to begin with, as amply evidenced by the Godavari set I itself. The victors asserted themselves against the aggressive overlord and they issued charters in their own names.[89] They seem to have been irresistibly enchanted by the high sounding title of Indrabhaṭṭāraka crediting him with the victory in the *chāturdanta-samaras*. So, being victorious they appear to have thought it quite becoming of them to appropriate that title for themselves, in slightly modified and elongated forms.

But it is also to be particularly noted that neither the Godavari set I, nor any other evidence, supports the conclusion that Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman was slain in the battle by Indrādhirāja.[90] In fact Pṛithivīmūla issued the charter only because Indrādhirāja knocked down the elephant Kumuda that confronted the other elephant Supratīka, presumably of the allies. Nor does the record indicate that the Vishṇukuṇḍi was on the back of the elephant Kumuda. On the other hand, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's complete victory over the members of the coalition is well testified to by the Ramatirtham charter from which one may deduce that nearly two decades after

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

the said conflict,[91] the Vishṇukuṇḍi ruler was in full control over the Pḷakirāshṭra which was in the north far beyond the territories ruled by Pṛithivīmūla and some other members of the coalition. The charter also indicates that by c. 553 A.D. (*i.e.* the date of the Ramatirtham charter) he had already encroached well into the Kaliṅga country of the Gaṅgas. Therefore the following might have been the result of the battle under question :

The Godavari set I is clear enough to indicate how hastily (*sarabhasam*) the anti-Indrabhaṭṭāraka coalition was constituted by the disparate but over enthusiastic chiefs motivated by the sole desire of putting down Indrabhaṭṭāraka.[92] There is little wonder that a coalition, so hastily formed, proved to be fragile enough to break itself after the flush of its first victory disappeared. Thus, circumstances show that, though defeated at first, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman subsequently found a more opportune time and broke the already loose and hotch-potch coalition and brought under his control its members one by one. So Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's claim in the Ramatirtham plates, of victories won in many battles of the *chāturdantas* may also refer to his success in the later part of the struggle between himself on the one hand and the confederates on the other.

The result was that many families like the Māṭharas, Vāsishṭhas who were perhaps members of the coalition were totally wiped out once for all and they were not heard of any more. The chiefs of the family of Pṛithivīmūla turned to be loyal chieftains of the Vishṇukuṇḍi kings and went to the extent of standing by the side of that monarch's son during the time of a great crisis as we shall see in the next chapter. Similarly the family of the Rāmakāśyapa-gōtrins too became so attached to the overlord that a member of that family thought it fit to name his own son after the overlord's son Vikramēndravarman II.[93] In the history of the Eastern Gaṅgas there is a dark period of about 25 years after c. 535 A.D., *i.e.*, the date of the Jirjingi plates. Again between the Gaṅga Indravarman I and his son Hastivarman, some rulers are known to have been ruling.[94] These facts do indicate a sort of political unstability. Therefore it may be justifiably concluded that in his struggle with the rebellious feudatories, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman might have lost a few battles to begin with, but won the war at the end.[95]

The second and perhaps more important achievement of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman was his success in forcing all his kinsmen to vacate their aggression of the main land of the Andhra country. In the last section we have traced how Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's cousin Mādhavavarman III together with the *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja* Guṇabhartṛi followed a policy of aggression towards Vikramēndravarman I and had occupied the Masūlipaṭṇam area. After winning over the feudatories, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman at an appropriate time probably in the middle of the second decade of his reign, crossed swords with his cousin. It seems that his superiority in arms, in guts, and in skill over that of his opponents gave him a decisive victory.[96] The records of his son are unanimous in declaring that he drove out all his kinsmen. But nowhere is it recorded that he killed any of his cousins. The expressions *aśēsha* (or *samagra*) *dāyāda* 'all kinsmen' probably includes, besides Mādhavavarman III, his accomplice Guṇabhartṛi also. We do not know whether Mañchyaṇṇabhaṭṭāraka had sons and if so whether they were in good terms with Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

The theory of compromise between Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman and his cousin Mādhavavarman III has already been dealt with in the last section.

The victory of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman over his cousins has already been placed after c. 541 A.D., the approximate date of the Ipur set II. It may also be assigned to a date earlier than c. 553 A.D., *i.e.*, the 27th regnal year when Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman issued his Ramatirtham charter (526+27=553). Some writers are of the view that as the Ramatirtham plates do no speak of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's victory over his cousin, the said achievement is to be placed after the date of that charter.[97] But the same charter clearly indicates that Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman had already extended his dominions at least as far as the Srikakulam District and that he was camping somewhere in the north as we shall see later. This would have been possible provided he had cleared off completely the aggression from his home-land. Moreover, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's repeated victories in the innumerable *chāturdanta-samaras* referred to in the Ramatirtham charter itself may as well include his victory in one or more wars against his *dāyādas*.

Before proceeding further, it may be well to bear in mind two important landmarks in the history of the Deccan of the age. Firstly, the rise of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman in the Eastern Deccan almost coincided with the rise of a new power, *viz.*, the Chālukyas, under Pulakēśi I in the western part of the peninsula as evidenced by his Badami inscription of Śaka 465 or 543 A.D.,[98] *i.e.*, almost the period when Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman finally succeeded in clearing of all aggressions from his dominions.

Similarly the emergence of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman coincided more or less with the fast sinking and final disappearance of the Vākāṭaka empire in the Deccan. The former might have been the effect, or cause, or more probably both, of the latter. The above study of the political career of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman would suffice to show how in crushing down ruthlessly the rebellious chiefs, in driving out the aggressors from his kingdom and in bringing under him the Kaliṅga country, the Vishṇukuṇḍi made best use of the political unstability that followed the death of Harishēṇa, the vanquisher of the rulers of Andhra, Kaliṅga, etc. The causes of the sudden collapse of the mighty Vākāṭaka power are not known. The contention that the struggle between the two houses of the Vākāṭakas lead them to their decline[99] may be only partially true as we are still in the dark regarding how the Vatsagulma house, after asserting itself, by the spectacular military achievements of the great warrior Harishēṇa should disappear all on a sudden following the death of that king. Depending on the romance *Daśakumāracharita* of the subsequent age some would attribute the above phenomenon to the incompetance of Harishēṇa's successor and to the treacherous defection of his feudatories.[100]

In this context some copper coins attributed to the Vishṇukuṇḍis discovered recently in the Vidarbha region seem to be quite significant. A few of them have been found actually at Pavner, *i.e.*, the ancient Pravarapura, the capital of the main line of the Vākāṭakas.[101] Basing on them scholars have conjectured that at one time in its history Vidarbha or a portion of it was included within the dominions of the Vishṇukuṇḍis.[102] If this is correct, then, subject to the confirmation by future researches, it may be further suggested that being a Vākāṭaka of the main line through his grandmother, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman might have felt that he too had

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

some claim, distant though, over the Vidarbha kingdom perhaps as there was no member in the main branch to lay claim to it. After all, Pavner is hardly 150 miles to the north from the Karimnagar District, which, as indicated by the numerous coins found there, lay well within the Vishṇukuṇḍi dominions. So, it is likely that he tried to fill up the political vacuum in the Vidarbha region and then probably struck the final blow at the root of the already falling Vatsagulma house of Harishēṇa who, as we have seen earlier, doubly sinned against the Vishṇukuṇḍis by his aggression in Andhra and Vidarbha. Therefore, there may be some truth even in his tall claim of having obtained the lordship of the whole of the *chakarvarttikshētra* by his victories in many a *chāturdanta* battle.[103] Here *chakravarttikshētra* obviously signifies South India bounded by the waters of the three seas and of the Rēvā rivers.[104]

The active participation of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman in the politics of the Vākāṭaka empire seems to have compelled him to come into conflict with the Nalas. Probably taking advantage of the political confusion that ensued the decline of the Vākāṭaka power, the king Bhavadattavarman of the Nala family of the Bastar-Jeypor region had already started penetrating well into the Vidarbha area. It is evidenced by his own grant of the village Kadambagiri, whose identification with the modern Kalamba (Yeotmal District in Berar) is generally accepted.[105] Most probably it was Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman who drove the Nala out of the Vidarbha country and crippled his power by conducting raids into his home province.[106] However, it seems that the Vishṇukuṇḍi was subsequently vanquished by the successors of Bhavadattavarman. For, we find that the later's son Skandavarman asserting himself, not long after, in the Jeypore region as proved by his Podagadh inscription that records the repopulating of the area earlier depopulated and the renewal of some earlier grants.[107] Similarly Arthapatibhaṭṭāraka,[108] a son,[109] or grandson[110] of Bhavadattavarman managed to occupy the city Nandivardhana, the earlier capital of the Vakātakas of the main line and issued his Riddhapur plates, most probably confirming, or rather renewing, Bhavadattavarman's earlier grant of Kadambagiri, which perhaps had fallen into disuse in the meanwhile, obviously due to the political upheaval in the area.[111]

Probably by the end of his reign, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman came into conflict with Īśānavarman, the Maukhari king of the north. As the Vishṇukuṇḍis, once feudatories of the Vākātakas, were thriving on the ruins of the latter's empire in the Deccan, so also the Maukharis, an ancient family who had been feudatories of the Guptas were flourishing on the ruins of the empire of their masters in the northern India and were ruling over the south Bihar and U.P. Īśānavarman was the first Maukhari king to assume the imperial title *Mahārājādhirāja*. The Haraha (Barabanki District, U.P.) inscription of the time of that monarch dated in V.S. 611 (554 A.D.),[112] credits him with a victory, in a war with one Andhrādhipati described as the master of thousands of rutting elephants. The relevant passage of the inscription under question runs :

Jitv=Āndhrādhipatiṁ sahasra-gaṇita-trēdhā-ksharad-vāraṇam etc. (verse 13)

The Jaunpur (Jaunpur District, U.P.) fragmentary inscription of one of the successors of Īśānavarman[113] seems to inform us that the above battle was fought somewhere in the Vindhya region. The seventh line of that inscription reads :

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

The theory of compromise between Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman and his cousin Mādhavavarman III has already been dealt with in the last section.

The victory of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman over his cousins has already been placed after c. 541 A.D., the approximate date of the Ipur set II. It may also be assigned to a date earlier than c. 553 A.D., *i.e.*, the 27th regnal year when Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman issued his Ramatirtham charter (526+27=553). Some writers are of the view that as the Ramatirtham plates do no speak of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's victory over his cousin, the said achievement is to be placed after the date of that charter.[97] But the same charter clearly indicates that Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman had already extended his dominions at least as far as the Srikakulam District and that he was camping somewhere in the north as we shall see later. This would have been possible provided he had cleared off completely the aggression from his home-land. Moreover, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's repeated victories in the innumerable *chāturdanta-samaras* referred to in the Ramatirtham charter itself may as well include his victory in one or more wars against his *dāyādas*.

Before proceeding further, it may be well to bear in mind two important landmarks in the history of the Deccan of the age. Firstly, the rise of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman in the Eastern Deccan almost coincided with the rise of a new power, *viz.*, the Chālukyas, under Pulakēśi I in the western part of the peninsula as evidenced by his Badami inscription of Śaka 465 or 543 A.D.,[98] *i.e.*, almost the period when Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman finally succeeded in clearing of all aggressions from his dominions.

Similarly the emergence of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman coincided more or less with the fast sinking and final disappearance of the Vākāṭaka empire in the Deccan. The former might have been the effect, or cause, or more probably both, of the latter. The above study of the political career of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman would suffice to show how in crushing down ruthlessly the rebellious chiefs, in driving out the aggressors from his kingdom and in bringing under him the Kaliṅga country, the Vishṇukuṇḍi made best use of the political unstability that followed the death of Harishēṇa, the vanquisher of the rulers of Andhra, Kaliṅga, etc. The causes of the sudden collapse of the mighty Vākāṭaka power are not known. The contention that the struggle between the two houses of the Vākāṭakas lead them to their decline[99] may be only partially true as we are still in the dark regarding how the Vatsagulma house, after asserting itself, by the spectacular military achievements of the great warrior Harishēṇa should disappear all on a sudden following the death of that king. Depending on the romance *Daśakumāracharita* of the subsequent age some would attribute the above phenomenon to the incompetance of Harishēṇa's successor and to the treacherous defection of his feudatories.[100]

In this context some copper coins attributed to the Vishṇukuṇḍis discovered recently in the Vidarbha region seem to be quite significant. A few of them have been found actually at Pavner, *i.e.*, the ancient Pravarapura, the capital of the main line of the Vākāṭakas.[101] Basing on them scholars have conjectured that at one time in its history Vidarbha or a portion of it was included within the dominions of the Vishṇukuṇḍis.[102] If this is correct, then, subject to the confirmation by future researches, it may be further suggested that being a Vākāṭaka of the main line through his grandmother, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman might have felt that he too had

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

some claim, distant though, over the Vidarbha kingdom perhaps as there was no member in the main branch to lay claim to it. After all, Pavner is hardly 150 miles to the north from the Karimnagar District, which, as indicated by the numerous coins found there, lay well within the Vishṇukuṇḍi dominions. So, it is likely that he tried to fill up the political vacuum in the Vidarbha region and then probably struck the final blow at the root of the already falling Vatsagulma house of Harishēṇa who, as we have seen earlier, doubly sinned against the Vishṇukuṇḍis by his aggression in Andhra and Vidarbha. Therefore, there may be some truth even in his tall claim of having obtained the lordship of the whole of the *chakarvarttikshētra* by his victories in many a *chāturdanta* battle.[103] Here *chakravarttikshētra* obviously signifies South India bounded by the waters of the three seas and of the Rēvā rivers.[104]

The active participation of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman in the politics of the Vākāṭaka empire seems to have compelled him to come into conflict with the Nalas. Probably taking advantage of the political confusion that ensued the decline of the Vākāṭaka power, the king Bhavadattavarman of the Nala family of the Bastar-Jeypor region had already started penetrating well into the Vidarbha area. It is evidenced by his own grant of the village Kadambagiri, whose identification with the modern Kalamba (Yeotmal District in Berar) is generally accepted.[105] Most probably it was Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman who drove the Nala out of the Vidarbha country and crippled his power by conducting raids into his home province.[106] However, it seems that the Vishṇukuṇḍi was subsequently vanquished by the successors of Bhavadattavarman. For, we find that the later's son Skandavarman asserting himself, not long after, in the Jeypore region as proved by his Podagadh inscription that records the repopulating of the area earlier depopulated and the renewal of some earlier grants.[107] Similarly Arthapatibhaṭṭāraka,[108] a son,[109] or grandson[110] of Bhavadattavarman managed to occupy the city Nandivardhana, the earlier capital of the Vakātakas of the main line and issued his Riddhapur plates, most probably confirming, or rather renewing, Bhavadattavarman's earlier grant of Kadambagiri, which perhaps had fallen into disuse in the meanwhile, obviously due to the political upheaval in the area.[111]

Probably by the end of his reign, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman came into conflict with Īśānavarman, the Maukhari king of the north. As the Vishṇukuṇḍis, once feudatories of the Vākātakas, were thriving on the ruins of the latter's empire in the Deccan, so also the Maukharis, an ancient family who had been feudatories of the Guptas were flourishing on the ruins of the empire of their masters in the northern India and were ruling over the south Bihar and U.P. Īśānavarman was the first Maukhari king to assume the imperial title *Mahārājādhirāja*. The Haraha (Barabanki District, U.P.) inscription of the time of that monarch dated in V.S. 611 (554 A.D.),[112] credits him with a victory, in a war with one Andhrādhipati described as the master of thousands of rutting elephants. The relevant passage of the inscription under question runs :

Jitv=Āndhrādhipatiṁ sahasra-gaṇita-trēdhā-ksharad-vāraṇam etc. (verse 13)

The Jaunpur (Jaunpur District, U.P.) fragmentary inscription of one of the successors of Īśānavarman[113] seems to inform us that the above battle was fought somewhere in the Vindhya region. The seventh line of that inscription reads :

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Vindhyādrēḥ prati-randhram=Andhrapatinā śaṅkā-parēṇ=āsāditam[114]

The next line of the same record speaks of the warriors of Andhra and their army of elephants and it reads :

Vāraṇ ānāmghaṭāsu vyāptēsh=ūtkṛishṭa-khaḍga-dyuti-khachita-bhujēshv=Andhrasēnā-bhaṭēshu...

The identification of this Andhrādhipati, the opponent of Īśānavarman has been a problem for scholars. Long ago Prof. Raychaudhuri proposed to identify him with Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* of the Polamuru set I,[115] and this view continues to be favoured by other scholars also.[116] Connecting Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya's* march to conquer the east[117] with Īśānavarman's claim of victory over the Andhra king ; and taking the Pāṇḍuvaṁśis (also called Sōmavaṁśis) of South Kōsala to be feudatories and helpers of the Maukharis in vanquishing the Andhra king ; some writers have propounded a theory of Maukhari-Pāṇḍuvaṁśi marriage alliance of political importance. They also believe that Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* conquered and occupied the city of Tīvara of South Kōsala. In support of this contention our attention is drawn to that Vishṇukuṇḍi king's title *Trivaranagarabhavana* etc.[118] But, one should not forget that Īśānavarman's defeat of the Andhrādhipati is to be placed before the date of the Haraha inscription, *viz.*, 554 A.D. while Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya's* march to conquer the east took place more than half a century later, *i.e.*, by 612 A.D. [119] At the same time, the Vishṇukuṇḍi chronology adopted here would show that the Andhrādhipati under question could have been only Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman and not anybody else.[120] This identification seems to be supported also by the description of the Andhrādhipati as a master of a sizeable army of rutting elephants. For, as has already been shown, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman had an exceptionally strong army of elephants. [121]

It is hard indeed to guess the reason for a war between Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman of the south and Īśānavarman of the north. We are totally in the dark also about what could have brought them to the Vindhya mountains,[122] where they confronted one another. However, the following course of events may be suggested. It is possible that the Later Gupta king Dāmōdara Gupta and his son Mahāsēna Gupta, who was a brother of the grandmother of the Pushyabhūti emperor Harshavardhana (acc. 606 A.D.)[123] belonged to the period under question. The said Later Gupta was the ruler of Mālava, according to the *Harshacharita*.[124] It is known that he and the Maukhari Īśānavarman were fighting with one another,[125] and that the Maukhari killed the above mentioned Dāmōdara.[126] At the same time, as we have already seen, the Balaghat plates refer to the Vākāṭaka suzerainty over Mālava.[127] Taking all these points into consideration, one cannot totally rule out a probability of a confrontation of the Maukhari in the Vindhyan region with the Vishṇukuṇḍi interested in the Vākāṭaka affairs.

One more thing to be remembered in this connection is this. The Haraha inscription refers to the Śūlikas, as being vanquished by Īśānavarman along with the Andhrādhipati. Prof. Raychaudhuri had identified the Śūlikas with the Chālukyas of Bādāmi.[128] Some scholars have accepted this view, though some others would disagree.[129] If this identification is accepted, then it may be suggested that the Chālukya Pulakēśi I, or his son Kīrttivarman I who acted probably as his father's commander-in-chief,[130] perhaps joined the Vishṇukuṇḍi against the Maukhari.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

In that case the inclusion of the king of Magadha in the list of rulers over whom Kīrttivarman claims to have won victory in the Mahākūṭa (Badami) pillar inscription,[131] may not be totally without substance. For, the Maukhari kingdom, in fact, included portions of Magadha.[132]

Another, and perhaps more plausible explanation of the Maukhari-Vishṇukuṇḍi confrontation in the Vindhya range seems to lie in the aggressive policy followed by Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman in the east. As we have already seen, it is likely that the Ramatirtham plates were issued from the place called Nisaṅgama or the modern Saṅgam almost on the Andhra-Orissa border. It has also been suggested that Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman probably had vanquished the Gaṅga Indravarman I and this created a political unstability in Kaliṅga. Perhaps, there was none to block Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's raid further north. Again the accession of Īśānavarman is placed in c. 550 A.D.,[133] and the Haraha inscription, the earliest reporter of the Andhra-Maukhari conflict is dated in 554 A.D. Therefore it is reasonable to think that the above conflict actually took place not long before, but in c. 552 or 553 A.D. itself, which seems to have corresponded to the 27th year of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman when that monarch was on the Andhra-Orissa border. Moreover the Śūlikas and the Gauḍas of the sea-shore over whom Īśānavarman claims to have won victories besides the Andhrādhipati, may be identified, as suggested by Prof. R.C. Majumdar, respectively with the Śulkis of Orissa and some powers in Bengal.[134] Therefore, it is very likely that the Maukhari was conducting raids in the south-eastern direction. It is natural that the two aggressive monarchs, *viz.*, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman and Īśānavarman inevitably found themselves confronted with one another somewhere in Orissa.

Another thing to be borne in mind in this connection, is this : The Nāgārjuni Hill (Gaya District) cave inscription of the Maukhari Anantavarman calls that hill by the name Vindhya.[135] Fleet correctly remarked that it is a part of the Vindhya mountains which, though most conspicuous in Western and Central India, do extend right across the peninsula until, passing through the neighbourhood of Gayā, their easternmost spurs reach and disappear in the valley of the Ganges at Rājmahāl.[136] Most probably it is to this or some other wing of the Vindhyas in the east within the dominions of the Maukharis, that Rājyaśrī, Harshavardhana's sister, the Maukhari Grahavarman's widow, and the captive of the unnamed Mālava king, might have escaped, as graphically narrated by Bāṇa, from the prison at Kanauj and taken refuge there without the least apprehension of any trouble.[137] Now, it may be pointed out that another wing of the same Vindhyas bends down southward about Chōṭānāgpur and its spurs reach and disappear somewhere in the former Keonjar State in Orissa. This wing too, just like the other wing at Gayā, has every right to be justifiably referred to by the name Vindhya in the Maukhari inscription from Haraha. The cumulative effect of all these seems to point to a probability of a confrontation between Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman and Īśānavarman somewhere in that wing.

Whatever might have been the venue of the war, it is certain that Īśānavarman was the victor. There is no reason to discredit the claim of the Maukhari especially when there is no record on the Vishṇukuṇḍi side giving evidence to the contrary. As may be gathered from the Maukhari records, the reason for Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

defeat seems to be his undue dependence on his elephant force, which, though a source of strength in the plains, is only a source of nuisance in the hilly terrain. In this aspect the Vishṇukuṇḍi stands in a good comparison to Harshavardhana. For, in the succeeding century, that Pushyabhūti king, because of his use of an enormous army of elephants, lost his battle against the Chālukya Pulakēśi II in the Vindhyan region, where the very absence of that army was an additional strength as realised by the Chālukyan conqueror, like the Maukhari king did earlier.[138]

But one should not forget the fact that even the eloquence of the Maukhari inscriptions does not allow us to conclude that the Andhrādhipati and other opponents of Īśānavarman referred to in the Haraha inscription were all compelled to accept the Maukhari suzerainty[139] and that their territories must have come under the sway of the Maukhari occupation.[140] On the other hand, the fact that it was the Andhrādhipati who had collected his army to meet the Maukhari in the Vindhya region, far away from his home perhaps suggests that the Vishṇukuṇḍi had already been conducting aggressive wars. But he failed miserably when he confronted the Maukhari. In this context the name Indrabhaṭṭārikā of the queen of Śarvavarman, the son of Īśānavarman[141] seems to attract our attention. For, it strongly suggests a probability that she might have been a daughter (or atleast a close relative) of the Vishṇukuṇḍi Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman.[142] In that case, it would appear that the rivals of the conflict probably found it expedient to wave olive branches in the Vindhyan forest and concluded a peace-treaty which resulted in the marriage of a Vishṇukuṇḍi princess with the Maukhari prince Śarvavarman.

After his conflict with the Maukhari, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman does not seem to have lived long. He died probably within a year or two thereafter. It is not known whether he died a natural death or fell in one of the battles he fought. Yet the fact that his son Vikramēndravarman II, though a boy, was to be enthroned by the council of ministers (*prakṛiti-maṇḍala*) seems to imply that Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman died perhaps in a battle (with a Nala king ?) and that with a view to avert a probable confusion, his ministers enthroned the boy prince.[143]

Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman was not a warrior and conqueror alone. He was also a person interested in the institutions of peace. He is said to have gifted away plenty of lands, cows, girls, gold, etc. He maintained and supported *ghaṭikās, i.e.*, educational institutions.[144] His *ghaṭikās* were probably of the type of the one at Kāñchī to which the Kadamba Mayūraśarman went sometime in the 4th century to get proficiency in all precepts.[145] As no earlier monarch of the Andhra region claims to have set up *ghaṭikās*, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman may be considered perhaps as the first king to establish *ghaṭikās* there. There is nothing to indicate the exact place where the *ghaṭikās* of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman were situated. A locality called Asanapura is known to have had a *ghaṭikā* in the subsequent age and the Eastern Chālukya king Jayasiṁha granted lands to a Brāhmaṇa member of that *ghaṭikā*.[146] Though Asanapura still remains to be satisfactorily identified, there is no doubt that it was within the Vēṅgī country and it was a place of importance as indicated by the fact that the said Chālukya king issued some of his charters from that place.[147] The donee of the Polamuru set II is said to be an inmate of the *sthāna* (*i.e.*, probably the *ghaṭikā-sthāna*) at Asanapura. As none of the Eastern Chālukyas is known to have set up any

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

ghaṭikā, the one at Asanapura was the *ghaṭikā*, or one of the *ghaṭikās*, established by Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman.[148]

Regarding the religion of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman it may be stated that he was the first Vishṇukuṇḍi member to style himself as *Paramamāhēśvara* and *Paramabrahmaṇya* though the earlier rulers of the dynasty called themselves as devotees of the Lord of the Śrīparvata (*i.e.*, Śiva) and followed the Vēdic religion by performing innumerable Vēdic sacrifices. Similarly, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman was perhaps the first known ruler to bear the *biruda*, *Satyāśraya*. Another *Satyāśraya*, *viz.*, Pulakēśi I was probably his younger contemporary, as we saw earlier. The other *Satyāśrayas*, *viz.*, Pulakēśi II, *Satyāśraya* Dhruvarāja Indravarman of the Goa plates and others belonged to subsequent times.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. No. IX, line 13.
2. See EI, XXII, p. 20 ; APGAS, No. 10, p. 16.
3. ED, pp. 419 ff ; CA, pp. 207, 223.
4. EI, XXXVI, p. 8.
5. Above Ch. I, sect. ii.
6. Cf. ED, p. 412 ; JAHRS, XXXI, p. 40.
7. No. X, lines 3-4.
8. AHD, p. 91.
9. No. VI, lines 4-5.
10. See her Riddhapur plates (CII, V, p. 36 lines 8-9).
11. See above Ch. IV, sect. iii.
12. No. VIII, line 10.
13. CII, V, p. lvi.
14. No. X, line 1.
15. No. VIII, line 10.
16. CII, V, p. 108, verse 18.
17. See, above Ch. III, sect. iii.
18. See ibid., Ch. IV, sect. ii.
19. See below, sect. ii.
20. See below Ch. VII, sect. i ff.
21. See No. X, line 2.
22. ARE, 1920, p. 97 ; EI, XVII, p. 338.
23. JDL, XI, p. 51.
24. SS, p. 133 ; CA, p. 209 ; ED, p. 429. See also APGAS, No. 8, p. 13.
25. BRA & AH, p. 38 ; EHAC, pp. 200-01.
26. EI, VI, pp. 315 ff. The same charter speaks also of the Kudūrahāra, *i.e.*, a district with the headquarters at Kudūra. This district also figures under the name Kudrāhāra in the Sālaṅkāyana charters. See ibid., p. 316 ; SS, pp. 92 ff.
27. AHD, p. 85.
28. Cf. EI, XVII, p. 337 ; SS, pp. 106, 134 ; ED, p. 483.
29. SS, p. 106 ; EHAC, pp. 205-06.
30. See below.
31. EI, XVII, p. 339.
32. JDL, XI, p. 54.
33. It is immaterial for us whether *Guṇabhartṛi* was a personal name of the prince, like Guṇamudita of a Telugu Chōḍa prince (EI, XXVII, p. 251) or it was a *biruda* like *Guṇabhara* of the Pallava Mahēndravarman I (see SII, XII, p. 5, No.8) and *Guṇabhājana* of the Pallava Paramēśvaravarman (SII, XII, p. 10, No. 20 ; EI, X, pp. 8-9).
34. SS, p. 103 ; etc.
35. ED, pp. 419, 482.
36. See EHAC, p. 205 n. 13. Dr. Sircar too has accepted the reading *47* now. See CA, p. 209.
37. EHAC, p. 207 ; CA, p. 209.
38. SS, p. 134 ; EHAC, p. 205.
39. For example, the Śuṅga king Pushyamitra and the Maitraka king Bhaṭarka, both starting their career as army commanders under their respective overlords, did not assume any regal title even after they became independent.
40. We have also got instances of *adhirājas* like Indrādhirāja of the Godavari set I, (No. XI), Brahmādhirāja of the South Indian Inscription (See IEG, *s.v.*) and Vidyāvinīta Pallavādhirāja of the Kuram plates of Paramēśvaravarman I (SII, I, p. 150, line 54) etc., who were not overlords, but were subordinates or officials only.
41. See above, Ch. IV, sect. ii.
42. See below. See also Appendix V.
43. See below Ch. VIII, sect. iii.
44. See above Ch. IV, sect. ii ; Ch. VIII, sect. iii ; Appendix V.
45. See below. The practice of the Andhra king appointing his grandson as his own governor of the newly conquered territory south of the Kṛishṇā was perhaps as old as the days of the Sātavāhana king Puḷumāvi II. See VIJ, V, p. 83.
46. See Appendix V.
47. Nos. VII, VIII and IX.
48. See below Ch. VIII, sect. iii.
49. CII, V, p. 108, verse 18.
50. Connecting Harishēṇa's claim of victory over the Trikūṭa, Andhra etc., with the title of Mādhavavarman III, a writer had suggested that at that time the Vishṇukuṇḍis were an Andhra power and that such defeats would have been repaid and those victories would have provided the Vishṇukuṇḍis the occasion for taking over the Vākāṭaka titles and glories (EHAC,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

p. 189). But this explanation could hardly be an answer to the question why, of all the Vishṇukuṇḍi rulers, Mādhavavarman III alone, and not anyone else should assume such a title (See Appendix V). This question gains more strength especially when the same writer himself assigns the Ipur set II to about 600 A.D. (EHAC, pp. 205, 208 ff.) *i.e.* long after Harishēṇa.

51. See sect. iii, of this Ch.
52. EHD, pp. 187-88.
53. ED, p. 486.
54. See Ch. VIII, sect. iii.
55. IC, XV, p. 18 ; CA, p. 224.
56. CA, pp. 210, 224-25.
57. Fleet's reading *Pūkivishaya* (IA, XX, p. 16) has been corrected by Hultzsch (EI. IX, p. 318). See also ARE, 1909, p. 109.
58. ED, pp. 492-93.
59. ARE, 1909, p. 109 ; EI, XII, p. 133 ; ED, p. 493; EHAC, p. 200.
60. BRA & AH, p. 116.
61. SS, p. 137 ; CA, p. 210.
62. Cf. ED, pp. 492-93.
63. Cf. the expression *khandhāvārā nagarā Kudūrāto* 'from the camp, the town Kudūra', in the Kondamudi plates (EI, VI, p. 316, text lines 1-2). The dropping of the prefix *ni* may not matter much. Cf. the synonyms *nivāsa* and *vāsa*. And *saṅgama* and *saṅga* are also synonyms.
64. See below Ch. VI, Sect. i.
65. See also EI, XXII, p. 20 ; XXIII, p. 93 ; QJMS, XXX, p. 327.
66. See below Ch. VI, sect. i.
67. See below Ch. VII, sect. i.
68. See above Ch. III, sect. iv.
69. No. XI, lines 17 ff.
70. BG, p. 334 ; CA, p. 252.
71. ECV, p. 67 ; EHD, p. 473.
72. EI, IV, p. 195.
73. AHD, p. 91 ; BRA & AH, p. 116 ; SS, p. 113 ; CA, pp. 210, 225.
74. ECV, p. 66 ; EHD, p. 473.
75. For some feeble objections to Fleet's theory see SS, p. 113 ; QJMS, XXX, p. 325.
76. JBBRAS, XVI, p. 116 ; SS, p. 114 ; ED, p. 494 ; CA, p. 225.
77. See Ch. VII, sect. ii. For conflicting views on the question whether the Vishṇukuṇḍi Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman and the Eastern Gaṅga Indravarman I were contemporaries or not, see JAHRS, II, pp. 157 ff ; V, pp. 179 ff.
78. AHD, pp. 93-94 ; BRA & AH, pp. 116, 122 ; ED, p. 599.
79. See below Ch. VII, sect. i and ii.
80. Ibid.
81. JBBRAS, XVI, p. 116. See also below Ch. VII, sect. i and ii.
82. EI, IV, p. 195, n. 2 ; EI, XII, p. 134.
83. CII, IV, p. 282, verse 9.
84. For a brief sketch of the history of these families see CA, pp. 212-14.
85. BRA & AH, p. 117 ; IC, XV, pp. 17 ff ; CA, pp. 223 ff.
86. AHD, pp. 76, 91 ; CA, p. 225.
87. See EHD, p. 187. For the date 475-500 A.D. for this Vākāṭaka king see JRASB, XII, pp. 1 ff ; CII, V, pages vi ff.
88. For some untenable views on the members of the coalition see ED, pp. 496, 599-600. See also BRA & AH, p. 117.
89. I.e. Nos. XI, XII and XIII.
90. Cf. ED, p. 495. Fleet too felt that Indrabhaṭṭāraka was probably slain, not in the battle referred to in the Godavari set I, but in a battle that ensued it. (JBBRAS, XVI, p. 116).
91. See below.
92. No. XI, lines 17-18.
93. See below Ch. VII, sect. iii.
94. Ibid., sect. ii.
95. See AHD, p. 91. To conclude that as a result of this conflict, the Vishṇukuṇḍi lost his northern marches to his rising namesake of Kaliṅga (CA, p. 225) is to ignore all these facts. What is more important is that Indrabhaṭṭāraka seems to have made an incursion further north to meet the Maukhari as we shall see subsequently.
96. Cf. No. VIII, lines 11-12.
97. QJMS, XXX, p. 324.
98. EI, XXVII, pp. 4 ff.
99. CA, p. 187.
100. CII, V, pp. xxxii, xxxiii. But see above Ch. III, sect. ii, and n. 62 ; above sect. ii.
101. JNSI, XXVIII, pp. 164 ff. and pl.
102. Ibid., p. 167.
103. No. VIII, line 11.
104. See ibid., lines 8-9. See also above Ch. IV, sect. ii.
105. EI, XIX, p. 102 ; CA, p. 188.
106. As the characters of the Podagadh and Riddhapur epigraphs may have to be placed about 550 A.D., it is a bit difficult to believe that Nala Skandavarman's father Bhavadattavarman was a contemporary of the Vākāṭaka Narēndrasēna or his son

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Pṛithivīshēṇa II (c. 450-470 A.D.), Cf. CII, V, p. xxvii ; CA, p. 184. In fact, scholars are inclined to suggest (EI, XXI, p. 155 ; CA, p. 189) that the adversary of Skandavarman of the Podagadh inscription was the Chālukya Kīrttivarman I (567-97 A.D.). And this suggestion would assign Bhavadattavarman to a latter period only. However, as there is nothing to show that Kīrttivarman went as far east as Pōdāgaḍh, his Nala adversaries (Aihole *praśasti* verse 9) are usually located in the nearby Naḷavāḍi in the Bellari-Kurnool region (BG, pp. 282, 345; EHD, p. 208). So, the adversary of the Nalas of the Bastar-Jeypore region may be identified with Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, who is known to have held sway in the Śrīkākulam-Vizagapaṭṇam region just adjacent to the region of the Nalas. Or, maybe Kīrttivarman, as a viceroy of his father joined the Vishṇukuṇḍi king against the Nalas of Pōdāgaḍh region also as he did against the Maukharis. See below.

107. EI, XXI, pp. 155 ff ; see also above Ch. III, sect. iv and n. 90.
108. It is also not unlikely that the *bhaṭṭāraka*-ending of the name Arthapatibhaṭṭāraka, among the member of the Nala family indicates an influence of the name Indrabhaṭṭāraka.
109. CII, V, p. xxvii and n. 6.
110. CA, pp. 88-189.
111. The Riddhapur plates (EI, XIX, pp. 100 ff) seem to signify a confirmation, or more probably a renewal of Bhavadattavarman's grant by Arthapati.
112. EI, XIV, pp. 110 ff.
113. CII, III, pp. 228 ff. The Jaunpur inscription, as we have now, is a tiny fragment of a big inscription. Each line of the extant portion contains about 28 letters on an average while nearly 72 letters are lost in the beginning of each line and also an indefinite part that was below the extant portion (ibid.). As the available portion contains only one name *i.e.* Īśvaravarman, Fleet, who edited the record, ascribed it to that monarch, the father of Īśānavarman. Hirananda Sastri, however, assigned the inscription to Īśānavarman himself on the ground that the victory over the Andhrādhipati referred to in the Jaunpur inscription must be the one with which Īśānavarman is credited in the Haraha inscription. (EI, XIV, p. 112, n. 6). In fact a comparison of the characters of the Haraha inscription (Ibid., plate facing p. 118) on one hand and those of the Jaunpur inscription (CII, III, plate facing p. 230) on the other, would show that the latter record is later than the former. Therefore it is likely that the Jaunpur record belongs to the time of neither Īśvaravarman nor Īśānavarman but of one of the Maukhari rulers of the subsequent period. See also D.C. Sircar, JIH, XLII, pp. 127 ff.
114. CII, III, p. 230. On the ground that the inscription refers twice to the Andhra, it is believed that the Maukharis conquered the Andhra twice. (KM & SA, p. 96). But the first reference is to the pitiable condition of the Andhra king while the second one is to the elephant army of that king and it stands in good comparison to that found in the Haraha inscription. Therefore there can be any doubt that the war described in line 8 of the Jaunpur record and that described in the Haraha may be one and the same. So the historical information contained in lines 7 ff., may better be attributed, on the basis of the Haraha inscription to Īśvavarman's successor (*i.e.*, Īśānavarman) as Fleet himself thought (CII, III, p. 229).
115. PHAI, I Ed. 1923, p. 304 ; VI Ed. p. 602.
116. SS, pp. 126-27 ; CA, p. 209.
117. See below Ch. VI, sect. ii.
118. EI, XXIII, p. 116 ; QJMS, XXX, pp. 314 ff ; CA, p. 208.
119. See below Ch. VI, sect. ii. For other points raised by this theory see Appendix IV. There is also a theory that would identify Īśānavarman's opponent with Gōvindavarman *Vikramāśraya*, the father of Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya* (ED, pp. 511-13). Of course, this Gōvindavarman was a brother of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman and was a contemporary of the said Maukhari. Yet, it is extremely doubtful whether he could have taken an expedition independently of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman against the Maukhari. See below.
120. See also HK, p. 40.
121. That seems to be the reason why in the Jaunpur inscription a special reference is made to this army of elephants of the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Andhrapati.

122. The view that Iśānavarman raided the Andhra country and defeated the ruling king there (EI, XXIII, p. 116) ignores this point referred to in the Jaunpur inscription mentioned above.
123. CA, p. 97.
124. Ibid., p. 73.
125. Ibid., p. 72.
126. See ibid.; and the Aphsad inscription (CII, III, p. 203, lines 7-8.
127. See above Ch. IV, sect. ii.
128. PHAI, p. 602.
129. For conflicting views see HK, pp. 41-42, and CA, p. 227.
130. CA, p. 232.
131. IA, XIX, pp. 16 ff.
132. CA, p. 69.
133. Ibid. p. 70.
134. CA, p. 68. It is difficult to accept the view that the Śūlikas were the Chōḷas of the farther south (EI, XXIII, p. 116, n. 2 ; JAHRS, I, pp. 130-31 ; *Mau.*, p. 80).
135. CII, III, p. 227, text line 8.
136. Ibid , p. 227.
137. Cf. KM & SA, p. 97. See also CA, p. 122.
138. See the Aihole *praśasti* verse 23 (EI, VI, p. 6 ; and also p. 10, n. 6).
139. IA, XLVI, p. 127.
140. KM & SA, p. 97 ; *Mau.*, p. 83.
141. CA. p. 68.
142. For example the Ikshvāku Vīrapurushadatta' queen Rudradharabhaṭṭārikā was perhaps related to the Śaka king Rudrasēna II (SS, p. 23 ; AIU, p. 225). The Maukhari Iśāna-varman's grandfather Ādityavarman's queen Harashaguptā was probably a sister of the Later Gupta king Harshagupta (PHAI, p. 604). The Pushyabhūti Harsha-vardhana's grandfather Ādityavardhana's queen Mahāsēnaguptā was also possibly a sister of the Later Gupta king Mahāsēna-gupta (ibid., pp. 606, 613 ; CA. p. 97).
143. No. VIII, lines 14-15. See also above n 90.
144. See Appendix VI.
145. EI, VIII, p. 32, verse 10.
146. Ibid; EI, XVIII, pp. 56 ff.
147. Ibid., EI, XXXI, p. 134.
148. See Appendix VI.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CHAPTER VI
DECLINE AND FALL

IN the last chapter we saw that Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's energy restored the Vishṇukuṇḍi power. However during the period of his successors the power of the dynasty again started declining and it finally disappeared by 612 A.D. The disappearance of the Vishṇukuṇḍis is perhaps more mysterious than their rise. Some circumstantial evidences alone can explain how their fall came.

(i) VIKRAMĒNDRAVARMAN II

Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman was succeeded to the throne by his eldest son Vikramēndravarman II, also called sometimes Vikramēndrabhaṭṭārakavarman of whom we have got the following three epigraphs :

(1) *The Chikkulla Plates* : Issued from his victorious camp at Lēnḍuḷūra by Vikramēndravarman II, this charter records the royal gift of the village Rēgōṇṛam to the Three-eyed god Sōmagirēśvarānātha or Sōmagirīśvarānātha (Śiva). The gift village was on the south-eastern direction of the village Rāvirēva on the Kṛishṇabeṇṇā (*i.e.*, Kṛishṇā) in Natapati District. The king is described as the eldest son of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, as the grandson of Vikramēndravarman (I) and as the great-grandson of Mādhavavarman, the performer of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and other sacrifices. The record is dated in the fifth lunar day of the eighth fortnight of the summer season in the tenth year of the reign of Vikramēndravarman II. Unlike in other Vishṇukuṇḍi copper-plate grants, no *ājñā* or executor is mentioned here in this charter.

The place of issue of the charter, *viz.*, Lēnḍuḷūra has been identified unanimously by scholars with the modern Dendaḷūru, about five miles to the north of Ellore (Ēlūru) in the Ellore Taluk of the West Godavari District.[1] This place is on the ruins of the city of Vēṅgī,[2] the capital of the Sālaṅkāyanas whom the Vishṇukuṇḍis succeeded to power in the Coastal Andhra. Consequently, Lēnḍuḷūra has been taken by scholars to be the Vishṇukuṇḍi capital.[3] However, Dr. Sircar seems to be right when he argues that the place was specially mentioned in the present charter as a place of issue, not because it was the capital, but because it was not the normal residence (*i.e.*, capital) of the Vishṇukuṇḍi king.[4] As we have already seen, the capital of the Vishṇukuṇḍis was known by the name Trivaranagara and it is to be located in the modern Tiruvūru.

The village Rāvirēva on the north-west of the gift village has been identified by R. Sewell with the modern Rāvirela[5] (16° 50′ N 80° 10′ E) near the Kṛishṇā in the Nandigama Taluk and this identification has been endorsed by other scholars also.[6] Consequently the gift village Rēgōṇṛam is also to be located nearby. The territorial division Natapāṭi is the same as the Nātavāḍi *vishaya* of the Māṅgallu grant of Amma II[7] and Nāthavāḍi or Nāthavāṭi country mentioned in the inscriptions belonging to the 12th-13th centuries.[8] They all come from the Nandigama Taluk and speak of the places of the *vishaya* that are to be located in the said taluk.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

So, the division might have roughly corresponded to the modern Nandigama Taluk Krishna District. Kielhorn took Sōmagirēśvarānātha wrong for Sōmagirīśvaranātha and viwed it to be the name of a temple.[9] Another scholar believes it to be the name of a *liṅga* established in a temple at Lēnḍuḷūra itself,[10] while a third scholar locates the temple on the bank of the Kṛishṇā and concludes that it has been destroyed by the floods of that river.[11] However, it seems that the name of the god in question had some connection with the place Sōmagiri (17° 45′ N. 82° 25′ E.) in the hilly tract of the Narasipatnam Taluk of the Visakhapatnam District, just adjacent of the Tuni division wherefrom the record comes.

(2) *The Tummalagudem Plates, Set II* : This record is Buddhistic in nature. Unlike other records of the family, this charter begins with a verse that introduces the ruling monarch *viz.*, Vikramēndravarman II. Here he is referred to by his title *Uttamāśraya* and is described as the son of *Satyāśraya* which is apparently a title of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, the father of Vikramēndravarman II. After tracing the Vishṇukuṇḍi genealogy from Gōvindavarman down to the ruling monarch (which we have studied in detail already in the first chapter) the record proceeds to say that while being in the Paramabhaṭṭārikā-mahāvihāra, on the Kārttika ba. 8th in his eleventh regnal year, the ruling monarch Vikramēndravarman gifted away the village Irundōra, for the enjoyment of the Buddhist monks evidently of the above *vihāra*. The said *vihāra* is stated to have been built by Paramabhaṭṭārikāmahādēvī, who was the mother of Mādhavarāja, was a princess of the Pṛithivīmūla family exalted by its marital alliance with the Vishṇukuṇḍis and was the queen of Gōvindarāja, a member of the Śrīparvata family and a builder of many Buddhist *stūpas* and *vihāras* throughout the Deccan. The charter continues to record that the king *Uttamāśraya* issued the present edict in Śaka year 488, when he came first to Śakrapura on his return after crippling the might of a Pallava king named Siṁha. A certain Śrīmūlarāja figures as *ājñāpanā* or executor of the grant and he is described to have restored the fallen fortunes of the family of the overlord, *i.e.*, Vikramēndravarman II.

The gift village Irundōra is difficult to identify. Indrapura, also called as Śakrapura, the place of the Buddhist monastery is the same as the one mentioned in the Tummalagudem set I, and it is to be identified with Indrapālaguṭṭa area (near Tummalagudem) where both the sets of the Tummalagudem charters have been discovered. The executor of the grant *viz.*, Śrīmūlarāja is to be identified with the chief Pṛithivīmūla of the Godavari plates,[12] or probably with a successor of him.[13]

(3) *The Kandulapalem Plates* : In the first chapter there was an occasion to refer to the angularity of the charters of this record giving it an archaic look. The genealogical portion of the record follows the corresponding part of the Chikkulla plates. However the ruling king Vikramēndravarman II styles himself in the present record neither as a *Mahārāja*, nor even as a *Rājan*. The charter records the royal gift of the village Tūṇḍi adjacent to Chamūpurā,[14] in the territorial division Vaiyērakara in favour of the Brāhmaṇa Svāmiśarman, son of Rudraśarman, a resident of the locality Āki, a member of the Kauṇḍinya *gōtra* and a scholar of the *Āpastamba-sūtra*. The king himself acted as the *ājñā* of the charter. The record is dated on the first lunar day (*pratipad*) of the second fortnight of the summer season of the fourteen regnal year of Vikramēndravarman. Scholars seem to be right in

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

identifying the gift village Tūṇḍi with Tūṇi[15] (the headquarter of the taluk of that name in the East Godavari District) and the donee's native village Āki with Ākivīḍu (Railway station) in the Bhimavaram Taluk of the West Godavari District. Consequently in the region around Tūṇi itself we may have to look for the locality Chamūpurā and the territorial division of Vaiyērakara.[16]

On the basis of the Tummalagudem set II that equates the eleventh regnal year of Vikramēndravarman II with Śaka 488 or 566-67 A.D., the date of his accession can confidently be fixed sometime in 556-57 A.D. In the last chapter we saw how, on the death of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, the latter's son, the boy prince Vikramēndravarman was enthroned by the council of ministers. Perhaps he was not more than 16 years, at the time of his accession. There are reasons for believing that all did not go well with this prince and the Vishṇukuṇḍi power must have started declining during his reign. We saw[17] how the Nalas, who had been kept at bay earlier by Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, started once again asserting themselves under Bhavadattavarman's son Skandavarman of that family in the Koraput District area, and how Arthapatibhaṭṭāraka, another member of the family superseded the Vishṇukuṇḍi in the Vidarbha region. Similarly the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga, who had been put down by Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, soon gained their strength and declared independence as evidenced by the Ponnuturu plates of the king Mahāsāmantavarman of that family dated in the Gaṅga year 64 or c. 560 A.D.[18] *i.e.*, just about four years after Vikramēndravarman's accession. Thus, almost all the acquisitions made by Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman by his military conquests seem to have been lost by Vikramēndravarman II.

Still worse misfortune soon befell the Vishṇukuṇḍi. His home country of Vēṅgī itself was invaded and occupied for a while by the powerful Siṁhavarman, a Pallava ruler of the south. On an earlier occasion[19] we saw how Mādhavavarman II annexed by vanquishing a Pallava ruler the Nellore-Guṇṭūr region that originally belonged to the Ānandas, and how the Vishṇukuṇḍis subsequently lost that conquest to the Ānandas, obviously helped by the Pallavas.[20] The latter seem to have been regaining their strength during the time of Vīravarman's son Skandavarman II of the Ōṅgōḍu grant (set I)[21] and the latter's son Siṁhavarman of the Jalalpuram plates.[22] Then the Pallava crown passed on to Siṁhavarman's brother Vishṇugōpa's son Siṁhavarman II.[23] The last mentioned Pallava must have been happy to see the weakness of the Vishṇukuṇḍi boy prince Vikramēndravarman II. In an opportune time he invaded and occupied a portion of the Vēṅgī country, the doab between the Kṛishṇā and the Gōdāvarī. In fact, an edict of him dated in his eighth regnal year, records his gift of the village Māṅgaḷūru situated in the Vēṅgōrāshṭra, which is generally held to denote the Vēṅgī country.[24] Even the doubts that have been entertained in some quarters[25] regarding the Pallava occupation of the Vēṅgī country is now removed by the Tummalagudem set II that speaks of an actual encounter of Vikramēndravarman II with the Pallava Siṁhavarman, as we shall see in the Vēṅgī country itself.

It is certain that Vikramēndravarman did not play the part of an aggressor in that war. For, there is no evidence to show that he ever crossed the Kṛishṇā and held any territory in the south of that river.[26] On the other hand, there are the said Māṅgaḷūru grant of Siṁhavarman that records the Pallava king's grant of a village

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

in the Vēṅgī country, and the Tummalagudem set II, that speaks of the sunken fortune of Vikramēndravarman's family and side by side refers to his conflict with Siṁhavarman. If these charters are studied together, they would show beyond doubt that it was Siṁhavarman, the Pallava, who was the aggressor by invading the Vēṅgī country and threatened the fortune of the Vishṇukuṇḍi family. Because Siṁhavarman seems to be occupying Vēṅgī country only for a very short period, as we shall see presently, and because the Vishṇukuṇḍi rule does not seem to have discontinued in Vēṅgī even during that period, it is reasonable to think that the Pallava did not occupy the whole of the Kṛishṇā-Gōdāvarī doab. Yet, there is nothing to show precisely which part of the doab the Pallava managed to occupy.

However, the Tummalagudem set II tells us that after crippling the power of the Pallava, the king Vikramēndravarman II returned first to Śakrapura or Indrapura, *i.e.*, near Tummalagudem in the Nalgonda District. This seems to indicate that the avenue of the Pallava-Vishṇukuṇḍi encounter was not very much removed from the Tummalagudem area. Therefore it is more likely that Siṁhavarman crossed the Kṛishṇā somewhere in the Sāttanapalle-Guṇṭūr region and occupied the Krishna District region of the Vēṅgī country. Therefore the village Māṅgaḷūru gifted by Siṁhavarman may be identified with Māṅgallu in the Nātavāḍi *vishaya* which was gifted in favour of a Brāhmaṇa nearly four centuries later by an Eastern Chālukya king.[27] That village has been correctly identified with the modern Māgallu or Maṅgollu in the Nandigama Taluk.[23] Both the places are near Tiruvūru or Trivaranagara, the Vishṇukuṇḍi capital since the days of Mādhavavarman II. Thus, it would look as if on account of the Pallava peril so very near, the Vishṇukuṇḍi king had shifted the royal headquarters from Trivaranagara to the earlier capital of the dynasty, *viz.*, Indrapura. That is why after vanquishing the Pallava, the Vishṇukuṇḍi first returned to that capital. This suggestion seems to draw further support from Vikramēndravarman's successor Mādhavavarman's claim as a delighter of the hearts of the womenfolk of Trivaranagara. A claim that seems to imply that just like Mādhavavarman II, his great-grandson Mādhavavarman IV also once again shifted the royal headquarters to Trivaranagara presumably from Indrapura.

From the Tummalagudem set II one may also gather that the Pallava-Vishṇukuṇḍi war must have been fought sometime before the eighth lunar day of the Kārttika of Vikramēndravarman's eleventh regnal year equated with the Śaka year 488, *i.e.*, sometime before October-November of 566 A.D. Vikramēndravarman's another charter, *viz.*, the Chikkulla plates, is dated in the eighth fortnight of the summer season of his own tenth regnal year, *i.e.*, sometime in June-July of 565 A.D. But, not even the slightest scent of the Pallava peril is felt in that charter, even though it records a grant of a village in the Nandigama Taluk itself. On these considerations one may reasonably assign the Pallava invasion of the Vēṅgī country to a period that separated the said two charters from one another. This period, *viz.*, 565-66 A.D., also perhaps coincided with the eighth regnal year of the Pallava Siṁhavarman in which his Māṅgaḷūru grant is dated.[29] For, the flush of his recent victory is betrayed by two of his epithets found in that record characterising him as 'to have pervaded the world by his valour' and 'to be very ambitious of conquering the whole earth'.[30] It is significant that these epithets are conspicuously absent in all the other charters of the king—both earlier and later.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

The Tummalagudem set II gives us to understand that in 566 A.D., Vikramēndravarman had succeeded in repelling the Pallava perhaps out of the Vēṅgī country itself, with the help of Śrīmūlarāja. It must be observed that in spite of all the repeated set-backs, Vikramēndravarman II seems to have been fortunate enough to enjoy the loyal support of some of his feudatories at least during the time of danger. Just now we saw the part played by Śrīmūlarāja or Pṛithivīmūlarāja in restoring the fallen fortune of Vikramēndravarman. The Kamdulapalem and Chikkulla plates indicate that the monarch had an undisputed hold over the East Godavari and Visakhapatnam Districts. This would have been possible, only if he was able to command the support and obedience of his feudatories of the Rāmakāśyapa *gōtra* ruling from Pishṭapura.[31] Therefore Vikramēndravarman's claim of being obeyed by the *sāmantas*[32] is not an empty boast.

Vikramēndravarman's last known date is the 14th year or 569-70 A.D. Though he came to power quite young, his reign period, as we shall see subsequently, does not appear to have been much longer. The theory that would make this monarch an adversary of the Chālukya king Pulakēśi II has already been dismissed.[33] Vikramēndravarman was a staunch devotee of the god of the Śrīparvata[34] and like his father, he styled himself as *Paramamāhēśvara.* But it may be noted that his adherance to Śaivism did not prevent him from patronising the Buddhist *vihāra* at Indrapura. All the records of Vikramēndravarman II are unanimous in picturing him as a highly virtuous king. A record endows him with the title *Uttamāśraya* 'a repository of the best (*things*)' or 'an asylum of the best (*men*)'. We are completely in the dark regarding the queen and other members of his family. The theory of Vikramēndravarman's adoption of Mādhavarāja of the Tummalagudem set II is due to the misunderstanding of the text of that record.[35]

Identifying Vikramahēndravarman of the Polamuru set I with Vikramēndravarman II, and connecting the former name with the name of the Pallava Mahēndravarman I (son of Siṁhavishṇu of Kāñchī) that occurs for the first time in the genealogical list of that family, Dubreuil had suggested that the Pallava Siṁhavishṇu might have married a daughter of Vikramēndravarman, the Vishṇukuṇḍi, and gave his own son the latter's maternal grandfather's name. By way of substantiating this theory of a Pallava-Vishṇukuṇḍi matrimonial contact, the said French scholar drew our attention to the Telugu epithets of Mahēndravarman I found in his inscriptions; the striking similarity of the images of the lions that are found in Mahēndravarman's cave at Śīyamaṅgalam and in the seal of the Chikkulla plates; and the resemblance of the sculptures in the Pallava caves with those found in the Uṇḍavalli caves, which according to Dubreuil, are of the Vishṇukuṇḍi origin.[36]

No doubt, on consideration of some chronological difficulties[37] one has to drop the idea of identifying Vikramēndravarman II with Vikramahēndravarman of the Polamuru plates. Similarly, one may not completely agree with the theory of the Vishṇukuṇḍi authorship of the Uṇḍavalli caves.[38] Yet there is nothing wrong, either chronologically or otherwise, with the above thesis of Dubreuil. In fact, the newly discovered Pallava inscriptions seem to suggest the middle and the last part of the sixth century A.D., respectively for the accession of Siṁhavishṇu and of his son Mahēndravarman.[39] So, even as early as 566 A.D. Vikramēndravarman II could have got a

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

daughter. And she would have been married to Simhavishṇu. In that case the above alliance between the Pallavas of Kāñchi and the Vishṇukuṇḍis might have been an offset to neutralise the growing power of the Pallava Simhavarman of the Nellore-Guṇṭūr region. Such an alliance might have been quite beneficial to both the families. It would have helped Simhavishṇu in superseding his kinsmen of the collateral line[40] and in annexing their territory by vanquishing, as he claims, both Simha (*i.e.*, Simhavarman II) and (his son) Vishṇu (*i.e.*, Vishṇugōpa II).[41] The above alliance may also explain how Mādhavavarman IV could embark upon a military conquest of the east, without the least fear of any armed aggression in his southern frontier by the expansionist Pallava neighbour Mahēndravarman I whose presence in the Guṇṭūr region is vouchsafed by his inscription at Chēzerla.[42] Therefore to reject summarily[43] the above suggestion of Dubreuil does not seem to be quite proper, though one may still wait for some stronger evidence to come up for putting the theory on firmer grounds.

(ii) MĀDHAVAVARMAN IV

The successor of Vikramēndravarman II was Mādhavavarman IV. The following record is the only source of information about him.

The Polamuru Plates, Set I: Those who would assign this record to a period earlier than that of the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham plates find its characters quite unsuitable to their theory. Hence, they have suggested that the record under question might be a later copy of an earlier record.[44] But, as will be seen subsequently, this recto is to be placed in c. 612 A.D.[45] The palaeography of the record is normal for that date and it bears some resemblance to the palaeography of the Hyderabad plates of Pulakēśi II dated Śaka 535 (613 A.D.).[46] Similarly, the language of the record is more flowery than that of other records of the family and it contains a few good examples of *ślēshālaṅkāras*[47] or puns as we find in the *Vāsavadattā*, *Kādambarī*, etc.

Issued by the *Mahārāja* Mādhavavarman *Janāśraya*, the son of Gōvindavarman *Vikramāśraya* and the grandson of Vikramahēndra, this charter records a royal gift, as *Janāśrayadatti*, of the village Pulōmbūru situated on the banks of the Daḷiyavāvi in the Guddavādi *vishaya* together with four *nivartanas* of cultivable land in the village Mayindavāṭaki, in favour of certain Brāhmaṇa named Śivaśarman, who was the son of Dāmaśarman, and the grandson of Rudraśarman and who was a resident of Kuṇṟūra in Karmarāshṭra and belonged to the Taittirīya school and to the Gautama *gōtra*. Mādhavavarman is credited with the performance of eleven *Aśvamēdhas*, the *Kratusāhasra* and the *Hiraṇyagarbha-mahādāna*. While he is endowed with the title *Mahārāja*, both his father and grandfather bear no such title, not even the title *Rājan*. The record is dated in the 48th (or 40th) regnal year of the king and the actual occasion, on which the grant was made, is stated to be a lunar eclipse that fell on the full-moon day of the month Phālguna. It is also said that the king made the grant when he was just crossing the river Gōdāvarī with a view to conquer the eastern direction. Two officers, one designated *Hastikōśa* and the other *Vīrakōśa*, acted as the executors of the grant.

All the places mentioned in the record have already been identified by scholars with certainty. Thus, the grant village Pulōmbūru is the modern Polamūru the find-spot of the charter in the Ramachandrapuram Taluk, East Godavari District. The

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Guddavāḍi *vishaya*, which is also mentioned in the Ipur plates (I), comprised, as we have already seen,[48] part of the East Godavari District. The Daḷiyavāvi river, may be the modern Tulyabhāgā, a distributary of the Gōdāvarī and on the northern banks of this, Polamuru is now situated. Mayindavāṭaki is nothing but the modern Mahēndravāḍa, just adjacent to Polamūru. Kuṇṛūra, the native village of the donee in Karmarāshṭra may be identical with the present Koṇḍūru in the Sattenapalle Taluk of the Guntur District. The Karmarāshṭra is known to have comprised parts of the Nellore and Guntur Districts. As in the present grant, so in the Polamuru set II and in the Godavari set I also the officials *Hastikōśa* and *Vīrakōśa* are mentioned. There seems to be much truth in Krishna Sastri's contention that by these two designations "perhaps the officers in command of the elephant force and infantry are meant".[49]

To fix up the 48th (or 40th) regnal year of Mādhavavarman IV in which his Polamuru charter is dated, the following important points may be taken into consideration:

(1) Vikramēndravarman II, whom Mādhavavarman IV succeeded ruled, as we have already seen, at least for 14 years, *i.e.*, upto 670 A.D.

(2) As we shall see later, it is now certain that by 616 A.D. the Chālukya king Pulakēśi II, had already set out for subjugating the Andhra country and he was actually camping near Kolēru lake in the Godavari District in that year. It is very significant that not a single record of the Western and Eastern Chālukyas, including the Aihole *praśasti*, noted for its vivid and detailed description of Pulakēśi's campaigns, speaks of the Vishṇukuṇḍis and the Chālukyan victory over them. In this connection one should not also lose sight of the fact that no Andhra king, or Andhra dynasty, let alone the Vishṇukuṇḍis for that matter, has been mentioned in the Chālukyan records as being vanquished by Pulakēśi II. Therefore it is reasonable to conclude that there was no Vishṇukuṇḍi in Andhra when Pulakēśi II entered the political arena there.[50] This may also probably indicate that the powerful Vishṇukuṇḍi dynasty had just disappeared and no king or dynasty worth the name had been successful enough to establish itself on the ruins of the Vishṇukuṇḍi power, when the Chālukya invaded the country. Then it would naturally follow that not much time had passed between the last date of the last Vishṇukuṇḍi and the date of the Chālukyan conquest of the Andhra country.

(3) The set II of the Polamuru plates is dated in the fifth year of the Eastern Chālukya king Jayasiṁha I that seems to have corresponded to c. 638 A.D. A comparative study of the contents of both the sets of Polamuru plates would show beyond any doubt that the donee of the set II of Jayasiṁha was the son of the donee of the set I of Mādhavavarman IV. Therefore without any assumption one should naturally believe that the Polamuru set I must be earlier than the set II (*i.e.*, of 638 A.D.) only by a generation, *i.e.*, about 25 years.[51]

So, taking into consideration these facts the date of the present charter may be fixed. During the period under question the lunar eclipse fell on the following days of the Phālgunī Pūrṇimās:

1) 574 A.D., Feb. 21, Wednesday.
2) 575 A.D., Feb. 10, Sunday.
3) 593 A.D., Feb. 21, Saturday.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

4) 594 A.D., Feb. 10, Wednesday.
5) 612 A.D., Feb. 22, Tuesday.
6) 621 A.D., Feb. 12, Thursday.[52]

The last (*i.e.*, the 6th) date, *viz.*, 621 A.D., February 12, may be safely dropped as it fell after the Chālukyan occupation of Andhra.[53] The first two dates, *viz.*, 574 A.D. and 575 A.D., may also be set aside as they were removed from 638 A.D. (*i.e.*, the date of Polamuru set II) by more than two generations, *i.e.*, about 63 years. The third and fourth dates also, *viz.*, 593 and 594 A.D., if accepted, would assign the accession of Mādhavavarman IV to 545-46 A.D. (593 or 594 *minus* 48), when Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman was still ruling all powerful. One may argue that the date of Polamuru I is only 40th year and hence Mādhavavarman IV could have ascended the throne in 554 A.D. (*i.e.*, 594 *minus* 40), *i.e.*, soon after the death of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. Even then, the gap between the two sets of the Polamuru plates would be about 44 years (*i.e.*, 638 *minus* 594) which certainly requires some special justification. On the other hand, the fifth date of the above list, *viz.*, 612 A.D. February 22nd, would satisfy all the requirements. It would reduce the gap between the said two charters to only 26 years (638 *minus* 612). It would also reduce to four or less years the period of confusion that followed the fall of the Vishṇukuṇḍi power and preceded the Chālukyan occupation of Vēṅgī. Again, the above date would assign the beginning of Mādhavavarman's independent rule either to *c.* 564-65 A.D.,[54] (*viz.*, when the weak rule of Vikramēndravarman II had already started) or to 572-73 A.D.[55] (*i.e.*, after the date of Kandulapalem plates). Thus on consideration of these facts, the fifth date, *viz.*, 612 A.D. February 22nd, may safely be accepted as the date of the Polamuru set I.

On more occasions than one it has been observed that Vikramahēndra of the Polamuru set I was identical not with Vikramēndravarman II but with Vikramēndravarman I.[56] So the relationship between Vikramēndravarman II and Mādhavavarman IV was that of cousin brothers, the latter being the son of the former's paternal uncle Gōvindavarman II. The last mentioned chief *viz.*, Gōvindavarman II obviously was a younger brother of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. Circumstances seem to suggest that he was a governor of some province or a military commander, under his elder brother. As his descriptions indicate,[57] he probably took active part in the wars fought presumably by Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman and deserved the title *Vikramāśraya* or 'repository of valour'. Gōvindavarman II probably died about 564-65 A.D. and he was succeeded by his son Mādhavavarman IV to the governorship. We have already seen the weakness of Vikramēndravarman II at the centre and his inability to preserve the kingdom intact.

It seems that after 572 A.D., Mādhavavarman succeeded Vikramēndravarman II to the imperial throne. That Mādhavavarman IV got the vast earth, *i.e.*, the whole of the Vishṇukuṇḍi kingdom, not from his father Gōvindavarman, but from Vikramēndravarman is vouched for by his own record.[58] It is not known whether Vikramēndravarman II died without any male issue to succeed him and consequently the throne went to his cousin, or whether Mādhavavarman IV himself managed to usurp the throne. At any rate, he soon vanquished the foes of his own and of the empire and revived the glory of the Vishṇukuṇḍi dynasty. By way of

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

celebrating his achievement of the sovereignty, recently acquired, and by way of heightening the prestige of his own dynasty and kingdom he performed *Aśvamēdhas* and other sacrifices. In doing so he was perhaps influenced by the glorious example of his illustrious great-grandfather Mādhavavarman II. The *Jānāśrayī Chhandōvichiti* joins the Polamuru set I in bearing witness to *Janāśraya* Mādhavavarman's victory over his enemies and to his performance of different great sacrifices. The very opening verse in that work runs as follows:

Sa bhūpatir=udāra-dhīr=jayati sampad-ēkāśrayō
Janāśraya iti śriyā vahati nāma sārthaṁ vibhuḥ ।
jitā vijita-śatruṇā jagati yēna ruddhā chiraṁ
makhair=urubhir=adbhutair=Maghavatō jayaśrīr=api ॥[59]

We have already seen how Mādhavavarman IV, once again following the example of Mādhavavarman II, transferred the royal headquarters to Trivaranagara from Indrapura to which Vikramēndravarman II had been compelled to shift the capital earlier.[60] Thus after Mādhavavarman II his great-grandson Mādhavavarman IV alone had the occasion to perform the *Aśvamēdhas*, etc. and to bring glory to Trivaranagara once again.[61] Other achievements of Mādhavavarman IV are not known.

Some scholars are of the opinion that the expressions (1) *sattvaṁ Kaiśavam*, (2) *kāntim=Aindavīṁ* and (3) *Vikrama* (in *Vikramād=āpta-bhūri-bhūḥ*) of the Polamuru plates (lines 15-16) denote respectively (1) the hill fort Harivatsakōṭṭa of the Uṇḍavāṭikā grant, (2) the city Indukānti and (3) the king *Raṇavikrama*, *i.e.*, Pulakēśi I. Hence the Polamurn charter is believed to indicate that Mādhavavarman captured the said hill-fort and the said city from the Chālukya Pulakēśi I.[62] In support of this contention our attention is drawn to a certain Jayasiṁha, who figures as the commander of the said fort in the Uṇḍivāṭikā grant and whom Dubreuil had doubtfully identified[63] with the early Chālukya Jayasiṁha, the grandfather of Pulakēśi I. Similarly we are also reminded of the epithet *śrit ēndukāntiḥ* of Pulakēśi I in the Aihole *praśasti* (verse 7). For, Fleet had once taken *indukānti* of that description as a geographical name of a city believed to be in possession of Pulakēśi I.

But it is needless to point out that the interpretation of *sattvaṁ Kaiśavam* of our inscription in the sense of the Harivatsakōṭṭa fort is far fetched. Similarly Kielhorn who edited the Aihole *praśasti* last has not taken *indukānti* as a name of a city. Even Fleet, though once held it to contain a reference to a city,[64] had rightly dropped that idea following the suggestion of Hultzsch.[65] Above all, as we have already seen, Pulakēśi I was a younger contemporary of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman.[66] He started ruling from c. 535 A.D. and continued to be on the throne till 566 A.D. when Vikramēndravarman II was still on the throne. Therefore the theory of a military confrontation between Pulakēśi I and Mādhavavarman IV may not be easy to maintain. On the other hand, as we are going to see later, some sort of a friendly relationship seems to have prevailed between the Chālukyas and the Vishṇukuṇḍis.

In the *Jānāśrayī Chhandōvichiti* there is a *daṇḍaka* running *Yēna prāṁśu* etc., in which one Mayūravaradhvaja (*i.e.*, the god Skanda-Kārttikēya) is praised to have split the peak of the Krauñcha mountain, likened to the *kumuda*. Believing that the expression Mayūravaradhvaja denotes *Janāśraya* Mādhavavarman IV also, it has

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

been suggested by some writers that the above passage contains a reference to that king's conquest of the south-west region, *i.e.*, the region of the *diggaja* named Kumuda.[67] But it is to be pointed out that the above *daṇḍaka* compares the whiteness of the Krauñcha mountain with that of the silver, Śiva's bull, moon-light and what is called *kumuda*. Therefore, the last mentioned word means 'water-lily' and not the *diggaja* of that name.[68] Again Mādhavavarman is not known to have a title like *Mayūravaradhvaja*. Moreover, the above passage is given in the work as an example of a particular type of composition known as *daṇḍaka*. It is very likely that this example also, just like many other ones in that work, is a quotation from an earlier work popular at that time. Therefore the passage may not refer to any achievement of *Janāśraya* at all.

Mādhavavarman IV is endowed with two interesting titles. They are *daśa-śata-sakala-dharaṇī-tala-narapatiḥ* and (2) *avasita-vividha-divya-strī-vara-nagara-bhavana-gata-parama-yuvati-jana-viharaṇa-ratiḥ*. Because both these titles are unipue and are not met with anywhere else in epigraphs they have puzzled the scholars. The significance of these titles has been discussed at length individually. Hence it would suffice to say here that the first title praises him as the lord of the entire *chakravartikshētra*, *i.e.*, the territory from the southern ocean to the Himālaya[69] and the second title praises Mādhavavarman's saintly disposition, his just rule resulting in the disappearance of all the *divyas* or ordeals; and his shifting of capital to Trivaranagara.[70]

By 612 A.D., Mādhavavarman IV must have set right the affairs at home and must have felt strong enough to set out on a military expedition to conquer a country in the east. This eastern country was no doubt the Kaliṅga kindom of the Gaṅgas who started asserting thesmelves by throwing off the Vishṇukuṇḍi yoke after the days of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. In fact, in Gaṅga year 79 (c. 575 A.D.) the Gaṅga king Hastivarman Rājasiṁha Raṇabhīta, perhaps a son of Indravarman I had already assumed the title *Mahārāja* and actually issued a charter gifting a village in the Śrīkākulam area[71] which, as the Ramatirtham plates show, had been well within the dominions of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. Therefore, it is natural that Mādhavavarman IV felt it necessary to put down the Gaṅga. The Vishṇukuṇḍi king must have made some arrangement to safeguard his frontiers in the south against the expanding Pallavas under Mahēndravarman I, and in the west against the rising Chālukyas under Pulakēśi II. We have already seen a possibility of some alliance between the Vishṇukuṇḍi and the Pallava.[72] Similarly we shall also see a probability of some understanding, in about 610 A.D., between the Chālukyas and the Vishṇukuṇḍis.[73]

We are totally in the dark regarding the course and fate of Mādhavavarman's campaign in the east. All that is known is only that he embarked upon that campaign and had just crossed the Gōdāvarī for that purpose in February 612 A.D. Mysteriously enough no more information has come to us regarding either Mādhavavarman IV or any subsequent members of his family. When Pulakēśi II captured Pishṭapura and fought on the banks of the Kolēru lake in 616 A.D., there was no Vishṇukuṇḍi to resist him. It will be seen later that it was only a certain Pṛithivīmahārāja who was ruling over Pishṭapura at the time of Pulakēśi's invasion.[74]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Similarly it was only a Pṛithivīyuvarāja who gave stiff fight to the Chālukyan invader on the banks of the Kolēru lake.[75] Moreover, some of the later records of the Eastern Chālukyas give us to understand that Kubja Vishṇuvardhana wrested the earth, *i.e.*, the Vēṅgī country from certain Durjaya[76]. Thus the end of Mādhavavarman IV as well as that of the Vishṇukuṇḍi family is completely shrouded in mystery. However, basing on the available circumstantial evidences, the following course of events may be suggested subject to future discoveries and researches on this question.

It has been accepted on all hands[77] that the family of Pṛthivīmahārāja of Pishṭapura stood in a feudatory relationship to the Vishṇukuṇḍis. As will be seen later,[78] the Tāṇḍivāḍa and Gōllāvalli grants of that Pṛithivīmahārāja[79] are to be assigned to the period in between the disappearance of the Vishṇukuṇḍis on one hand and the advent of the Chālukyas on the other. These grants indicate that the above chief had attained independence about the end of his career and that he was ruling over a territory that extended from Virajōnagara (*i.e.*, Jājpur in the Cuttack District) in the Kaliṅga country in the north down to the Kolēru lake in the heart of the Vēṅgī country in the south.[80] There can be hardly any doubt that this chief could have carved out for himself such a vast kingdom only on the ruins of the Vishṇukuṇḍi empire. Therefore it may be logical to infer that Mādhavavarman IV, perhaps being followed by his feudatories like Pṛithivīmahārāja fared very well in executing his ambitious scheme of Kaliṅga conquest and penetrated victoriously at least as far north as Virajōnagara or Jājpur. But his victory in that region probably turned to be a great disaster owing to some reason unknown to us now. Probably he died in the battle itself or soon afterwards. Maybe, there was no suitable prince living in the Vishṇukuṇḍi family to succeed Mādhavavarman IV and to consolidate his conquests. In any case, one may have to believe that the Vishṇukuṇḍi became the victim of his own ambition of the Kaliṅga conquest.

Thus seems to have come to an end the glorious epoch of the Vishṇukuṇḍi quite unexpectedly, creating all on a sudden a sort of political vacuum in the Vēṅgī country. It is well known that as in atmosphere, so in politics too a vacuum is always abhorred. Naturally a stormy period of civil war and struggle for supremacy must have ensued. Pṛithivīmahārāja, who, as we saw earlier, followed the suzerain to Kaliṅga, would waste no time. He proclaimed himself as the master of the vast area of his departed master's kingdom. Similarly Pṛithivīyuvarāja, who was ruling over the Guṇṭur area owing allegiance to the Pallava Mahēndravarman I, found it very convenient to march across the Kṛishṇā with his huge army and occupied the Vēṅgī country as far as the Kolēru lake.[81] Now the political unstability and confusion must have made the region quite ripe for a take-over by the Chālukya Pulakēśi II, the master conqueror of the age.

A situation of similar nature repeated itself in the history of the Vēṅgī country about three centuries later. In 922 A.D. the Eastern Chālukya Vijayāditya IV Kollabhigaṇḍa undertook his Kaliṅga campaign, won a spectacular victory in the same Virajāpuri itself (*i.e.*, Jājpur), but died either in the battle or soon afterwards. At that time too there ensued a stormy period of about a decade and a half that witnessed civil wars and struggle for supremacy. Then also the foreign invaders, *viz.*, the Rāshṭrakūṭas, tried their best to make profit out of the disturbed conditions of

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

the region.[82] The only difference was that unlike the Vishṇukuṇḍi family, the Eastern Chālukya dynasty was fortunate enough to have princes of its own to continue the rule and to revive the glory of the family.

Mādhavavarman IV was not only a reviver of his family prestige and a conqueror, he was also a noted patron of letters. A prosodical treatise called *Jānāśrayi Chhandōvichiti* is named after this king.[83] It seems to have been written by a scholar named Gaṇasvāmin in the form of a commentary on some *sūtras* or aphoristic rules.[84] As has been already pointed out, the king *Janāśraya* is praised, in the introductory verse of this work, as having put down all his enemies and to have performed many great sacrifices. As accepted by many,[85] this *Janāśraya* was none other than Mādhavavarman IV *Janāśraya.* To think of the Western Chālukya prince Avanijanāśraya Pulakēśi of Gujarat (738 A.D.) in this context [86] is to ignore totally that the title of that prince was not mere *Janāśraya* but *Avanijanāśraya* and that he is nowhere known as a performer of great sacrifices. This work on prosody may be assigned to the first decade of the seventh century at the latest. Incidentally it may be pointed out that this work quotes[87] a verse from the *Kirātārjunīya*[88] of Bhāravi. Consequently the composition of the last mentioned work may have to be assigned to the last quarter of the sixth century at the latest.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. EI, IV, p. 195; BRA & AH, pp. 93, 118; etc.
2. LARPM, Vol. I, pp. 34, 36.
3. BRA & AH, p. 93; ED, p. 502.
4. EI, XXXVI, p. 8.
5. HISI, p. 21.
6. AHD, p. 92.
7. See below.
8. See EI, VI, pp. 157, 159; ARE 1924, p. 117.
9. EI. IV, pp. 194, 198.
10. SS, p. 139.
11. ED, p. 502.
12. Nos. XI & XII.
13. See Ch. VII, Sect. i. In either case there seems to be no ground for the contention that Vikramēndravarman II slew Pṛithivīmūla and the *Adhirāja* Indra after the death of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. See ED, p. 500.
14. See also below Ch. IX, sect. i (8).
15. APGAS, No. 8, p. 3.
16. This name reminds us of the geographical name Vayirākaram where Kulōttuṅga Chōḷa I claims to have seized the rutting elephants of his enemies (SII, II, p. 233, text line 2). That place has been identified with Wairagaḍh in the Chanda District, Maharashtra (K.A.N. Sastri, *Cōlas*, Vol. I, p. 351). Hultzsch gives *Vajrākara* as the Sanskrit equivalent of Vayirākaram (SII, II, p. 235). It is interesting to note that there is a place called Vajraghaḍa in the Narsipatna Taluk and it is only about 25 miles north-north-east of Tūṇi.
17. Above Ch. V, sect. iii.
18. See above Ch. VIII, sect. ii.
19. Above Ch. IV, sect. ii.
20. Above Ch. V, sect. ii.
21. EI, XV, pp. 249 ff. and pl.
22. A. Soc. SI, 1960-62, pp. 95 ff.
23. Cf. ARE 1961-62, p. 3; EI, XXIV, pp. 299-300; SS, p. 205; CA, p. 279.
24. BRA & AH, pp. 93, etc.; SS, p. 71 n., p. 211; EHAC, pp. 2, 176-77; CA, p. 206. The identification of the Pallava adversary of Vikramēndravarman II with Siṁhavarman, the grandfather of Mahēndravarman I, (KESIH, p. 53) is, therefore to be dropped.
25. SS, p. 71 n.; ED, p. 236. *Vēṅgō-rāshṭra*, like *Vēṅgai-nāḍu* of the Tamil inscriptions and literature (See e.g. SII, II, p. 2; p. 232, n) denotes the Vēṅgī country.
26. The Chikkulla plates do not say that the gift village Rēgōṇṛam was on the southern side of the Kṛishṇā as taken by some (APGAS, No. 8, pp. 19-20). Rāvirēva, which is stated to be the adjacent village of Rēgōṇṛam has already been located in Nandigama Taluk on the northern side of the river.
27. See the Māṅgallu grant of Dānārṇava (EA, I, pp. 57 ff. Cf. EI, XXXI, pp. 37 ff.). It may be noted that in that grant the engraver had omitted the signs for the superscript *rēpha* very often. Therefore it is not unlikely that the intended in line 55 of the grant may be *Māṅgallūr=nāma grāmaḥ*. There is no evidence showing that Vēṅgīrāshṭra ever included part of the Guntur District during the period in question (SS, pp. 71 n, 212). Therefore, the identification of Maṅgaḷūr of the Pallava record with the modern Maṅgaḷagiri in the Guntur Taluk does not appear to be well founded (EHAC, p. 177).
28. EI, XXXI, p. 40.
29. Hence the importance of the Tummalagudem set II is immensely high in deciding the chronology not only of the Vishṇukuṇḍis but also of the Pallavas. Consequently one may have to drop the theory that would on the basis of the Māṅgaḷūr grant, assign the Pallava occupation of the Vēṅgī country to the supposed interval between the fall of the Sālaṅkāyanas and the advent of the Vishṇukuṇḍis (CA, p. 206; BRA & AH, p. 93.)
30. I.e. *Mahatā pratāpēna vyāpta-lōkaḥ* and *samagra-vasudhātalaika-vijigīshuḥ* (IA, V, p. 155, lines 11-12). Cf. *Kṛitsna-pṛithvī-jayārthēna rājñā*, a description of Chandragupta II in the undated Udayagiri Cave inscription (CII, III, p. 35, verse 5) perhaps indicating the recent and complete victory of that Gupta emperor over the Śakas with whom he was engaged in war at that time. See CA, p. 19.
31. Below Ch. VII, sect. iii.
32. No. VIII, lines 15-16. It is good to remember that the executor of this charter was actually a powerful *sāmanta*.
33. Above Ch. I, sect. ii.
34. No. VII, lines 1-2.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

35. JMU, XXXVIII, pp. 241 ff.
36. See *The Pallavas*, pp. 33-35.
37. See Ch. I, sect. ii.
38. See Ch. X, sect iii.
39. See *Prof. K.A.N. Sastri Felicitation Volume* (Madras 1971), p. 477.
40. CA, p. 279.
41. Cf. the king's description *Śrī-Simhavishṇur=jita-Simha=Vishṇur-balēna* 'Simhavishṇu who conquered by force (both) Simha and Vishṇu' in his Pallankovil plates (TPCP, p.27, verse 4). Cf. ibid., pp. 13 ff.; KESIH, p. 59.
42. No. XVIII.
43. HPK, pp. 77-78.
44. SS, p. 131, n.
45. See above Ch. I, sect. ii.
46. IA, VI, pp. 71 ff. See also below Ch. VIII, sect. i.
47. Cf. lines 8, 14-16.
48. See Ch. IV, sect. i.
49. ARE, 1914, p. 85. For Fleet's view see JBBRAS, XVI, p. 119, n. 14.
50. See below Ch. VIII, sect. ii.
51. The arguments that more than 50 years (SS, p. 110 f. and n.) or even 70 years (EI, XXII, p. 20) must have elapsed between the two sets of the Polamuru plates are based on some unnecessary assumptions and presumptions.
52. These equivalents are according to Robert Sewell's *Eclipses of the Moon in India* (London, 1898) and L.D. Swamikannu Pillai's *An Indian Ephemeris* (Madras, 1922), Vol. I, pt. I.
53. Cf. EI, XXIII, p. 90.
54. I.e. if the record is dated in the 48th year.
55. I.e. if the record is dated in the 40th year.
56. Above Ch. I, sect. ii; Ch. V, sect. i.
57. Cf. No. X, line 5.
58. Cf. *Vikramād=āpta-bhūri-bhūḥ*, No. X, lines 15-16.
59. JC, p. 1.
60. Above Ch. VI, sect. i.
61. Also see above Ch. I, sect. ii.
62. JDL, XI, p. 34, n.
63. AHD, p. 111.
64. ASWI, III (1878) pp 129 ff.; IA, VIII (1879) pp. 237 ff.
65. BG, p. 343, n. 5. It may also be pointed out when Fleet first edited the *praśasti* in IA, V (1876), pp. 69 ff., he too did not take *Indukānti* as a geographical name (ibid. p. 71].)
66. Above Ch. V, sect. iii.
67. QJMS, XXX, pp. 318-19.
68. The passage under question runs as: *Yēna prāmśu Krauñchasy=āgram maṇi-kanaka-vimala-navarajatapaṭala-Haravṛishabha-sakalaśaśikiraṇa-kumuda-sadṛiśaṁ + + + bhinnaṁ śaktyā + + + saḥ + + + Mayūravaradhvajaḥ* (JC, p. 66).
69. Appendix VII.
70. Appendix VIII.
71. Below Ch. VII, sect. ii.
72. Above sect. i.
73. Below Ch. VIII, sect. ii.
74. EI, XXIII, p. 96; ARE, 1955-56, p. 3. See also below Ch. VII, sect. iii.
75. See below Ch. VIII, sect. iii.
76. See JAHRS, XI, p. 85, lines 7-9. There the intended reading seems to be *Śrīpatir=vikramēṇ=ādyō Durjayād=Balitō dharām*. Dr. N. Venkataramanayya refers (ECV, p. 18) to other inscriptions also.
77. Prof. K.A.N. Sastri, IC, XV, p. 20; CA, p. 226. Dr. Sircar, ARE. 1955-56, p. 3.
78. Below Ch. VII, sect. iii.
79. Nos. XIV, XV.
80. See below Ch. VII, seet. iii.
81. See Ibid.
82. ECV, pp. 152 ff; EHD, p. 481 f.
83. Cf. the examples of the *Dhātuvṛitti* and the Vedic commentaries written by Sāyaṇa, but named after his brother Mādhava.
84. Cf. *paurāṇikēshu Paiṅgalādi-Chhandōvichitishu yathā-sambhavaṁ nyūn-ātiriktēkaṁ parīkshya, parihṛitya tad-dōsha-parihṛitām=apra-pañchām=an-ākulāṁ Jānāśrayīṁ Chhandōvichitiṁ Gaṇasvāmi-virachita-vyākhyāṁ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ* (JC, p. 1). For a scholarly paper *Jānāśrayī Chhandōvichiti* by V.A. Ramaswami Sastri see JOR, XVII, pp. 138 ff. where the writer clearly shows how the work surpasses the works of Piṅgala etc., on the subject, and how different works of the later times refer, as an authority on the prosody, to both the *sūtra* and the commentary as the works of Jaṅāśraya. On the basis of the Prākṛit metres dealt with in the work H.D. Velankar concludes that the author of the *Jānāśrayī* was a southerner by circumstances, but he had in himself the deep-seated love for the metres in Prākṛit languages of his native land somewhere in the north. See JBBRAS (NS), XXXI-XXXII, pp. 276 ff.
85. EI, XXIII, p. 93; CA, pp. 209, 225; JC, Introd. p. viii.
86. EI, XXIII, p. 93, n. 4.
87. Op. cit., p. 15.
88. *Viz. Atha Vāsavasya vachanēna* etc., same as *The Kirātārjunīya*, XII, verse 1.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CHAPTER VII

FEUDATORIES OF THE VISHṆUKUṆḌIS

SO far we studied in detail the history of the sovereign family of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. But, it was only through their feudatories that the paramount sovereigns were able to carry on the activities of their kingdom—both political and administrative. The feudatories were first subdued by a member of the paramount family and slowly they developed a sense of loyalty towards the central authority. However, as in the history of any other part of India, so also in the history of Vēṅgī too, the centrifugal tendencies had always been stronger than the centripetal forces. So, whenever the central authority fell into weak and incapable hands, the feudal lords found it convenient to declare independence, sometimes successfully and sometimes otherwise. The history of three such feudal families that was inter-connected with the history of the Vishṇukuṇḍis, may be studied briefly here.

(i) THE PṚITHIVĪMŪLAS

The family of Pṛithivīmūlas was the earliest of the feudatories of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. We have the following charters for the study of the history of the family.

(1) *The Godavari Plates, Set I:* This charter was issued by the *Rājan* Pṛithivīmūla from his victorious camp at Kāndāḷi. The chief is described as the son of Prabhākara Mahārāja, as a protector of the *varṇāśrama-dharma* and as a *Parama-māhēśvara.* The charter records the chief's order addressed to the officers and others of the Tāḷupāka *vishaya* informing them of his grant of the village Chūyipāka, surrounded by some four localities (names given) in the above *vishaya*, as a tax-free *agrahāra* in favour of 43 *Ātharvaṇikas* (scholars in the Athravaṇavēda) belonging to the Upādhyāya-kula. The grant was made at the instance of Indrādhirāja, who was the son of Mitavarman, a *dvija* of the locality called Maṇalkuḍi; who was one among the chieftains rising to root out Indrabhaṭṭāraka and who overpowered an elephant of the same. The benedictory portion of the grant contains the chiefs request that the grant may be protected by all, especially by the officers *Hastikōśa* and *Vīrakōśa.* The grant was made on the third lunar day of the fourth fortnight in the rainy season of the 25th year of the reign presumably of Pṛithivīmūla himself, as we shall see subsequently. The Tāḷupāka *vishaya* of the record may be identified with the region around the modern village Tāṭipāka in the Nagaram island of the Razolu Taluk of the East Godavari District. That island is even now known by the name Tāṭipāka-sīma.[1] The place of issue of the charter, *viz.*, Kāndāḷi, may be identical with the present Kadaḷi about five miles south-east of the said Tāṭipāka. The gift village Chūyipāka and the places mentioned as its adjacent localities are difficult to identify though there cannot be possibly any doubt that they were in the Nagaram island.

Viewing the chief's title *rājan* as an indication of his subordinate rank, Fleet entertained a doubt that the regnal year given in the record might be of the reign of

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Pṛithivīmūla's overlord.[2] But, it is now known that the overlords of the chief's family were the Vishṇukuṇḍis and that Pṛithivīmūla's contemporary was Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. At the same time, by the graphic description of the overthrow of that Indrabhaṭṭāraka himself by the confederacy of the chiefs including Pṛithivīmūla, the record testifies to the overflowing joy and pride of the chief on the independence which he had newly won,[3] or rather asserted successfully. Therefore it seems improbable that he could have dated that record of his in the regnal year of the vanquished sovereign. Again, even the sovereign kings like Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman etc., are also found endowed with the simple title *rājan* in their own records. Therefore the 25th year of the record may better be taken as the regnal year of Pṛithivīmūla only.

(2) *The Godavari Plates, Set II*: This is a Buddhist record. It is issued from a locality called Guṇapāśapura by Pṛithivī-Śrīmūlarāja otherwise called Mūlarāja, the son of Prabhākaramahārāja. In the preamble of the record both the father and the son are endowed with titles which are also found in the Godavari set I. One notable addition here is the epithet that credits the son with the victory in many *chāturdanta* battles—a title which is prominent in the description of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman in the Vishṇukuṇḍi charters. The formal portion of the charter records the chief's order addressed to the officers etc. of the Tāḷupāka *vishaya* informing them of the following. The chief gave his son Harivarman the village Kaṭṭucheruvulu bounded by some three villages (names given). Harivarman, on his part, gave away the village, free of taxes, for the enjoyment of the four necessaries (*chatush-pratyaya-paribhōg-ārtham*) of the community of the Buddhist monks, residing in a great monastery. The prince did so, after getting the permission of his father and after informing the *navakarma*[4] *vyāpār-ādhikṛita*,[5] an inmate of the monastery, stated to have been built by the prince himself[6] at the foot of the hill in Guṇapāśapura. It is said at the end, that the charter was made for the sake of the *Tāmbraparṇiyas*, or those belonging to the fraternities of the monks of Tāmbraparṇi, *i.e.*, Ceylon. This denotes that the monks of the monastery had belonged to the said fraternity. The charter bears no date. The Tāḷupāka *vishaya* has already been identified. It is difficult to identify the place of issue of the charter, *viz.*, Guṇapāśapura. Yet, the expression *pāśapura* of the name reminds us of the present Pāśarlapūḍi, a village about 3 or 4 miles to the east of Tāṭipāka. This place was probably not the capital of the chief as believed by some writers.[7] The gift village and its bordering localities are not identifiable.

(3) *The Tummalagudem Plates, Set II:* As we have already seen, this charter was issued by the Vishṇukuṇḍi Vikramēndravarman II in his eleventh regnal year corresponding to Śaka 488 (566 A.D.) and it records the king's grant of a village to the monastery built at Indrapura by the queen Paramamahādēvī, who was the mother of Mādhavarāja, and the wife of Gōvindarāja. This queen is said to be born of the *rājavaṁśa* or royal family, of Pṛithivīmūla. As the names of the husband and son of this queen are given, it is not unreasonable to expect the name of her father also given along with—rather than a simple mention of her family—in the portion describing her birth. So one may tentatively take her father's name to be Pṛithivīmūla. The executor of the charter was one Śrī-Mūla who claims to be the foremost among the *nṛipas* (*i.e.*, the feudatories of the king), to be born of a famous family and to have restored the sunken fortunes of his master (*i.e.*, Vikramēndravarman II, the issuer of the charter).

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

As we have already seen, the above Gōvindarāja and Mādhavarāja of this charter were no other than Gōvindavarman I and his son Mādhavavarman II respectively. Therefore we may have to take this Gōvindavarman's father-in-law Pṛithivīmūla to be an elder contemporary of his son-in-law. Hence, his reign period may be assigned to the second quarter of the fifth century. So, he was evidently much earlier than, and different from, his namesake who fought against Indrabhaṭṭāraka sometimes before 535 A.D. Similarly, we have also seen that the Godavari set I is dated in the issuer's 25th regnal year that fell sometime before 535 A.D. Consequently that chief's accession is to be assigned to a date c. 510 A.D. On the other hand, the Tummalagudem set II is dated in 566 A.D., *i.e.*, more than 56 years after the accession of Pṛithivīmūla of the Godavari plates (I). If it is permissible to allot 56 or more years of reign to that chief, then the executor of the Tummalagudem set II, *i.e.*, Śrī-Mūla, may be identified with the same Pṛithivīmūla of the Godavari plates. Otherwise this Śrī-Mūla may have to be viewed as later than, and different from that Pṛithivīmūla. Having thus studied the necessary records, we may try to connect the facts furnished by them.

This family may be called Pṛithivīmūla dynasty as stated in the Tummalagudem set II. From the above account we come to know of the existence of four or five members of the family. (1) Pṛithivīmūla I, the father-in-law of Gōvindavarman ; (2) Prabhākāra ; (3) his son Pṛithivīmūla II of the Godavari plates ; (4) his son Harivarman ; and probably (5) Śrī-Mūla, the *ājñāpanā* of the Tummalagudem set II.[8] The members of this family were feudatories of the Vishṇukuṇḍis at least since the time of Gōvindavarman I who has been assigned to c. 422-62 A.D. Prior to that time, no information about this family has come to us. From their charters it would appear that their kingdom, at least in the sixth century A.D., included the region of the modern Razolu Taluk, which was just adjacent to the Vēṅgī kingdom of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. Probably Tāḷupāka, "a place of some importance"[9] was the capital of their kingdom.

It was very probably Pṛithivīmūla I who achieved some political status and increased the prestige of the family by means of a matrimonial alliance with the Vishṇukuṇḍis. He gave in marriage his daughter Paramamahādēvī to his overlord Gōvindavarman. As a result of this marriage was born Mādhavavarman II, the greatest of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. Nothing is known regarding the religion of Pṛithivīmūla I, though we know that his daughter favoured Buddhism and built a Buddhist *vihāra* in Indrapura. In course of time there arose in the family a king called Prabhākara. The relationship between this chief and Pṛithivīmūla I is not known. Yet, it is clear that the latter's great-great-grandson Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, through his daughter, was vanquished by Pṛithivīmūla of the Godavari plates. Therefore taking the period and family into account it may be reasonable to guess that the vanquisher Pṛithivīmūla II too was a great-great-grandson, or at least great-grandson, of Pṛithivīmula I through the latter's son. If so, Prabhākara was the great-grandson, or grandson, of him. Then it would follow that between them, there might have been one or two chiefs in the family ruling roughly between 450 and 490 A.D.

Nothing is known about the achievements of Prabhākara. His epithets describe in general terms, his wide fame and devotion to god, Brāhmaṇas and elders. His

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

title *Mahārāja*, if it is really significant, may indicate that he had enhanced the dignity of his family and raised his status to that of a *Mahārāja*. In that case, it would appear that, being encouraged by the weakness of Vikramēndravarman I and by the general confusion prevailing during the period,[10] Prabhākara successfully threw off the Vishṇukuṇḍi yoke and became independent. That was perhaps the reason why both the sets of the Godavari charters of his son give the genealogical account of the family starting only from this chief, the first independent ruler of the dynasty. Prabhākara's epithets indicate that he was a follower of the Vēdic religion.

Prabhākara-mahārāja was succeeded by his son Pṛithivīmūla II sometime in the first decade of the sixth century. His name also appears in the forms of Śrīmūla, and Pṛithivīśrīmūla.[11] This indicates that the name of the chief was only Mūla and the words *Pṛithivī* and *Śri* were added to it evidently with a view to give a dignified look to the nomenclature, just as they were added to the name of the Eastern Chālukya Jayasiṁha of the subsequent age.[12] During the time of Pṛithivīmūla II, the independence of the family was in jeopardy. For, Vikramēndravarman's son and successor Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman started his warlike career and tried to bring under him the rebellious chiefs. The Godavari set I narrates how Pṛithivīmūla's ally, perhaps a subordinate ally at that time, Indrādhirāja, the Gaṅga chief overpowered in the battle an elephant called Kumuda, that dashed against another elephant named Supratīka which was mounted by somebody (name not given), and which obviously belonged to the side of the confederates. The circumstances seem to suggest that the elephant Supratīka was probably mounted by Pṛithivīmūla himself,[13] and that in a sense of gratitude towards Indrādhirāja for saving him in the battle, Pṛithivīmūla, issued the charter. An almost parrallel instance may be found in Nandivarman Pallavamalla (c. 730-96 A.D.) who issued his Udayendiram plates,[14] with a view to reward the heroism of the sword (*asi-dhārā-nishkray-ārtham*),[15] shown by his brave general Udayachandra in rescuing the monarch in the battle at Maṇṇaikkuḍi.

The victorious Pṛithivīmūla issued the charters in his own regnal years. The combat described in the Godavari set I has already been assigned to a period sometime earlier than 535 A.D. The vivid description of the rise of the confederates and of the achievement of Indrādhirāja on one hand and the grant in appreciation of the latter's help on the other, go to indicate that there might have been not much gap between the date of the battle and that of the grant, *i.e.*, the 25th regnal year of Pṛithivīmūla II. The chief also appropriated subsequently for himself the title of the vanquished Indrabhaṭṭāraka as a mark of his victory. His two epithets, *viz.*, *anēka-chāturdanta* etc., and *satata-gōbhūmi* etc., were originally of Indrabhaṭṭāraka. It is significant that the above epithets found in the Godavari set II are conspicuous by their absence in the Godavari set I. On that ground the former charter may be assigned to a period slightly later than that of the latter. Further, like the Vishṇukuṇḍis he styled himself as *Paramamāhēśvara* and *Paramabrahmaṇya*, and claimed to have gifted away cows, lands, etc., in plenty. His Godavari charter (I) itself testifies that he actually colonised a number of Brahmins well versed in the Atharvavēda. Like the Vishṇukuṇḍis he encouraged the *varṇāśramadharma* and yet, did not hesitate to show favour to the religion of the Buddha. Thus in several respects Pṛithivīmūla II seems to be the greatest of the family. His simple title *Rājan*, instead of indicating his subordinate rank, seems to exhibit the influence of his contemporary Vishṇukuṇḍi

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman who, in spite of his sovereign status, styled himself only as *Rājan*.

The independent status which the family enjoyed was not destined to last much longer. Within a few years, perhaps during the last days of Pṛithivīmūla himself or in the beginning of his son's time, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, as we saw earlier, asserted himself by crushing the confederacy successfully and by bringing under him the chiefs of that family.[16] Pṛithivīmūla II was probably succeeded by his son Harivarman. It is a matter of interest that for the first time we find now in this family a prince bearing the name ending in *varman*. Obviously in naming the princes of the family also the practice of the Vishṇukuṇḍis was followed by Pṛithivīmūla. Regarding Harivarman the only information given by his father's charter is that he fought successfully many fierce battles and that he favoured Buddhism. From the above it may be guessed that he might have taken a leading part, more than once, in Pṛithivīmūla's battles against the Vishṇukuṇḍi king. The next known member of the family was Śrī-Mūla who figures as the *ājñāpanā* of Vikramēndravarman II in 566 A.D. As has been pointed out earlier, he may, or may not, be identical with Pṛithivīmūla II In the latter alternative there is nothing to indicate his relationship with Harivarman. Yet, the typical name Śrī-Mūla seems to indicate that he was most probably the son of Harivarman and was named after his illustrious grandfather. He stood loyal by the side of his Vishṇukuṇḍi suzerain Vikramēndravarman II at the critical time of the Pallava peril and helped the Vishṇukuṇḍi in saving the kingdom from a sudden collapse.

No material is available now to show exactly what happened to the members of this family in the subsequent times. However, one may provisionally believe that like their northern neighbour Pṛithivīmahārāja,[17] they also might have helped Mādhavavarman IV in his eastern expedition in 612 A.D.[18] The total absence of any further information about the family perhaps suggests that the family of Pṛithivīmūla too disappeared more or less simultaneously with the dynasty of the Vishṇukuṇḍis after serving them for about seven generations.

(ii) THE GAṄGAS

On consideration of chronology, the rise of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga comes next to that of the Pṛithivīmūlas. Their rise is marked with an era, known as the Gaṅga era, that seems to have commenced sometime in 496-98 A.D.[19] The dynasty continued to rule nearly nine centuries and a half till about 1435 A.D. Many scholars have already dealt at length with the history of the Gaṅgas. Therefore it would suffice, if the scope of the study here is confined to the period between 496 and 612 A.D. There too it may be better to concentrate only on that part of the history of the Gaṅgas that is woven around their relationship with the Vishṇukuṇḍis and to ignore altogether their probable connection with the other contemporary dynasties.

One more thing that may be borne in mind in this connection is this : The Gaṅgas seem to have been quite reluctant to bear the Vishṇukuṇḍi yoke almost from the very beginning, and hence none of their records throw any light directly on their relation with the Vishṇukuṇḍis. Therefore though there are about ten[20] records bearing on the history of the dynasty of the period under consideration it would suffice, if one studies in detail here only two of these records, *viz.*, the one that

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

suggests that the founder of the dynasty had been a feudatory of the Vishṇukuṇḍis and the other that indicates that the Gaṅga had subsequently managed to throw off successfully the Vishṇukuṇḍi yoke. They are the following :

(1) *The Godavari Plates, Set I* : As we saw already, this charter was issued, by Pṛithivīmūla at the request of Indrādhirāja, the son of Mitavarman, of a *dvija* or twice-born family of the place Maṇalkuḍi. We have also seen the vivid picture given by the charter showing how a number of chiefs formed a confederacy and fought against the Vishṇukuṇḍi Indrabhaṭṭāraka and how the above mentioned Indrādhirāja played a vital role by knocking down in the battle the furious elephant Kumuda of the Vishṇukuṇḍi that charged against another elephant Supratīka mounted probably by Pṛithivīmūla himself.[21]

Scholars differ from each other on the question of identity of the said Indrādhirāja. Dr. Fleet[22] who proposed to identify Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the record with the Eastern Chālukya king of that name, believed that Indrādhirāja might be identical with either of the two Gaṅga kings, *viz.*, Indravarman of the Achyutapuram plates of the year 87 and his name-sake of the Chicacole plates of the year 128.[23] The scholars, who accept Kielhorn's identification of Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the charter with the Vishṇukuṇḍi of that name identify his opponent Indrādhirāja with Indra of the Gaṅga years 128-54.[24] Sticking on to Fleet's above theory of identification of Indrabhaṭṭāraka and assigning that Eastern Chālukya king to 673 A.D., some scholars feel it "difficult to establish" the identity of his opponent Indrādhirāja mentioned in the record.[25] For, in fact, there was no Indra at that time in any dynasty in the area who can be regarded as the son of Mitavarman. Recently a few writers have held that the father of Indrādhirāja was a Brāhmaṇa of Maṇalkuḍi and probably of non-monarchical rank and that the identification of Indra of the record with any Gaṅga king is therefore extremely improbable.[26] Basing on the fact that no Gaṅga Indravarman of the time under question is known to be the son Mitavarman, and basing on the assumption that Maṇalkuḍi is described in the Godavari plates as Indrādhirāja's capital which had never been the headquarters of the Gaṅgas, a writer has also questioned the identification of Indrādhirāja with any of the Gaṅga kings, and has concluded that he must have been a local chieftain in Kaliṅga.[27]

But the *varman*-ending of the name of Mitavarman denotes that he claimed to be a Kshatriya and not a Brāhmaṇa. Again the title *adhirāja* of Indra indicates that he enjoyed some political status, at least of a feudatory, if not of a sovereign. The description of the family as the one of the *dvijas* may not be incompatible with the above conclusion. For, *dvija* 'twice-born' includes Kshatriya also.[28] Even if *dvija* is taken to be a synonym of *Brāhmaṇa*, it may not exclude the Gaṅga kings as they are believed to be originally Brāhmaṇas like the Kadambas.[29] Again, now it is known that Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman of the record was none other than the Vishṇukuṇḍi monarch of that name who ruled during the period c. 525-55 A.D. Therefore, taking into account the period and the region under question, one may agree with D.R. Bhandarkar who identified[30] Indrādhirāja with the Gaṅga Indravarman, the issuer of the Jirjingi plates of the year 39, which we shall study next. None of the early Gaṅga charters of the first century of the Gaṅga era gives the name of the father of the respective kings who issued those charters. Therefore nothing pre-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

vents one from suggesting that the above Indravarman's father might have been one Mitavarman.

In the Godavari plates Maṇalkuḍi figures not as the headquarters[31] but only as a place where from the family of Indrādhirāja hailed. This place remains yet to be identified. Now it may be provisionally suggested that the above place may be identical with Maṇṇaikkuḍi of the Udayendiram plates of Nandivarman Pallavamalla, where his general Udayachandra is said to have won a battle,[32] and which has been identified recently by a writer with Mānyapura which was once the capital of the Gaṅgas in the Gaṅgavāḍi area and which had been referred to as Maṇṇai and Maṇṇē.[33] But, still earlier capital of the Gaṅgas of Mysore is located at Maṇkuḍa west of Channapaṭṇa,[34] in the Bangalore District. It is likely that both Maṇṇaikkuḍi and Maṇalkuḍi are identical with the above Maṇkuḍa. At any rate, these identifications will be in tune with the theory that the Early Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga represented a branch of the Gaṅga dynasty of Mysore.[35]

(2) *The Jirjingi Plates* : This is the earliest known charter of the Gaṅga family. It was issued from Dantapura by the *Mahārāja* Indravarman of the Gaṅga family who styled himself as the lord of Trikaliṅga. He was a worshipper of god Paramēśvara. His titles credit him with victories in the innumerable *chāturdanta* battles fought with the neighbouring rulers (*sāmantas*). The charter records the royal gift of the tax-free village of Jijjika in the division Vōṅkhārabhōga to two Brāhmaṇas *viz.*, Rudrasvāmin's son Agnisvāmin and the latter's son Rudrasvāmin—half the village each. The writer of the grant was one Dēvasiṁhadēva, the king's minister of war and peace. The epigraph is dated in the 21st lunar day of the month Vaiśākha in the 39th year. All scholars concur in attributing the year to the Gaṅga era of 496-98 A.D., and the palaeography of the record suits quite well to the first half of the sixth century A.D.

The place of issue of the charter, *viz.*, Dantapura is famous in Buddhist literature as a capital of Kaliṅga.[36] There is a difference of opinion among scholars in locating that city.[37] However, the verdict of the majority of writers is that it is to be located near Śrīkākulam.[38] The identification of Trikaliṅga of which Indravarman claims to be the lord, is a bit problematic.[39] But this much is certain. It must have comprised some three broad regions into which the entire Kaliṅga was perhaps divided. It is not known whether the title *Trikaliṅgādhipati* of Indravarman was a mere *biruda*, or it signifies that the king actually held control over the whole of the said three regions. The gift village Jijjika may be the modern Jirjiṅgi, the findspot of the charter near Tekkali in the Srikakulam District. Consequently we may identify the division Vōṅkhārabhōga with the region around the said Jirjiṅgi.

Having thus examined the necessary records, let us study the history of the Gaṅgas of the period. We have already seen that Indrādhirāja was an ally of Pṛithivīmūla.[40] From the Gōdāvarī plates (I) it is learnt that he was an active member of the confederacy of the feudatories who rose against the Vishṇukuṇḍi Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. This may suggest that he too, just as his coadjutors, like Pṛithivīmūla etc., had been a vassal of the Vishṇukuṇḍi king.[41] Again it has been admitted by scholars that the name Vikramēndra of the father of Pṛithivīmahārāja betrays a feudatory relationship that the latter's family stood to the Vishṇukuṇḍi rulers among

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

whom alone the name is met with more than once. It is also accepted that the feudatory Vikramēndra was a contemporary of his Vishṇukuṇḍi namesake.[42] Now, if the name Indra of Indravarman I of the Gaṅga dynasty is also viewed in the same light, it may likewise indicate, a feudatory relationship which the early members of the Gaṅga family had with the Vishṇukuṇḍis. For, among the royal families of the Deccan the earliest occurrence of that name is met with in the Vishṇukuṇḍi dynasty alone. In the earlier period it is not found in other dynasties including the family of the Gaṅgas of Karnāṭaka.

The general consensus of the opinion of scholars is that the early Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga belonged to some branch of the Gaṅga dynasty of the Gaṅgavāḍi country of Karnāṭaka.[43] The family of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga hailed from Maṇalkuḍi, *i.e.*, Maṇkuḍa in Gaṅgavāḍi, and settled in the Kaliṅga area. Like some of the early rulers of the Western Gaṅga dynasty[44] the members of the Gaṅga family of Kaliṅga were the worshippers of Śiva. They seem to have carved out a small principality of their own in the eastern part of the Kaliṅga country, *i.e.*, in the Śrīkākulam region some time in the last decade of the 5th century A.D. They used in their records an era of their own that began sometime in 496-98 A.D. Regarding this era it is believed that Indravarman of the Jirjingi plates dated his records in his own regnal years and this reckoning was continued by his successors and thus the Gaṅga era came to be.[45] However, it seems to be more probable that the era was founded to commemorate the foundation of the above Gaṅga principality. The founder of it might have been, therefore, either Indravarman himself or an immediate predecessor of his, possibly his father. The date of foundation, *viz.*, 496-98, falls in the last decade of the reign of Mādhavavarman II. Hence the first ruler of the family probably owed allegiance to the Vishṇukuṇḍi ruler for sometime.

As we have already seen, the fight between the Gaṅga Indra and the Vishṇukuṇḍi Indra was fought earlier than 535 A.D. As the grant of Chūyipāka (*i.e.* in the Godavari set I) was made at the request of Indrādhirāja for the merit of his own father and mother it is not unreasonable to believe that on the date of the issue of the Godavari plates the father Mitavarman was no more. Again it is significant that the latter is praised to have won victories in the *chāturdanta* battles. It is likely that he fell in one such battle fought probably with Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman noted for his innumerable battles of *chāturdantas*.

The way in which both Mitavarman and his son *Adhirāja* Indra are described in the Godavari set I may be an indication to the fact that the Gaṅga power had not yet attained a status of prominence. However the record does not fail to impress on us that Indrādhirāja had in him a powerful conqueror in the high potential. Therefore he soon emerged as a fulfledged king and assumed the title *Mahārāja* as we actually find him in his Jirjingi plates of c. 535 A.D. Moreover, like Pṛithivīmūla, he too appropriated for himself, but in an inflated form, the high sounding title of the vanquished Vishṇukuṇḍi that credits him with victories in the *chāturdanta* battles. It is noteworthy that such or similar title is not met with anywhere else in the known Eastern Gaṅga records. Sure, Indravarman's skill and guts raised him to a high status. But, he could not afford to maintain that status for long without inviting a rebuff from the warlike Vishṇukuṇḍi king. Predictably enough, the powerful Indra-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

bhaṭṭārakavarman asserted himself very soon over the Kaliṅga country. His Ramatirtham plates of c. 553 A.D. (*i.e.*, nearly two decades after the date of the Jirjingi plates), actually records his grant of a village in Bobbili Taluk which was the north-western neighbourhood of the Dantapura area held by Indravarman. As we have seen already, there is a strong possibility of the Vishṇukuṇḍi camping at that time somewhere further north in the Palkonda Taluk. The triumphant Vishṇukuṇḍi king continued his military campaigns further northward upto an offshoot of the Vindhyas.[46] All this goes to indicate that the power of the newly risen Gaṅga dynasty must have been eclipsed considerably. Perhaps that is the reason why Dantapura in the Śrīkākulam area figures as a Gaṅga capital in the records of the family only about a century later, *i.e.*, in the Purle plates of Indravarman, son of Dānārṇava, dated in the year 137.[47] There is nothing to reveal who might have been the Gaṅga enemy vanquished by the Vishṇukuṇḍi Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman.

The next known Gaṅga king is Mahāsāmantavarman or Sāmantavarman, the issuer of the Ponnuturu plates of the Gaṅga year 64 or c. 560 A.D.[48] It is not known whether he was an immediate successor of the Gaṅga Indravarman I.[49] His relationship with that monarch and with the next known ruler, *viz.*, Hastivarman, is also not known. The very name of his, *viz.*, Sāmanta, seems to smack of a status of the vassalage or of a military captainship. However one cannot be sure whether Sāmantavarman was a protege kept on the Gaṅga throne by the contemporary Vishṇukuṇḍi king. Even if he was so, he must have declared independence as soon as he found that Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman was no more by 555 A.D., and that the latter's son and successor was too young and weak to put under control his far-off vassal. The above Ponnuturu plates bear witness of that fact.

The next known Gaṅga ruler is *Mahārāja* Hastivarman Rājasiṁha Raṇabhīta of the Narasingapalli and Urlam plates respectively of the Gaṅga years 79 (c. 575 A.D.) and 80 (c. 576 A.D.).[50] As has been pointed out just now, his relationship with Sāmantavarman is not known. But scholars hold him to be a son of Indravarman I.[51] In that case, it may be a bit hard to explain how Sāmantavarman came to rule in between the father and son. Perhaps, it may add some strength to the doubt whether Sāmantavarman was an usurper backed by some other power, perhaps the Vishṇukuṇḍi. Hastivarman's first charter itself is a good witness to the fact that the Gaṅga power had once again asserted itself in the Varāhavarttanī *vishaya* corresponding to the coastal region between Śrīkākulam and Tekkali.[52] The next Gaṅga king known was *Mahārāja* Indravarman II Rājasiṁha of whom we get charters dated in Gaṅga years 87 (c. 583 A.D.), 88 (c. 584 A.D.), 91 (c. 587 A.D.) and 97 (c. 593 A.D.).[53] This monarch is taken to be the son of Hastivarman.[54] His own charter testifies that he had encroached well as far as the modern Narasannapēṭa region in the Srikakulam District.[55]

The next known date in Gaṅga era is 128 (c. 624 A.D.)[56] supplied by a charter of *Mahārāja* Indravarman III, considered to be a grandson of Indravarman II and a son of a Gaṅga prince who probably ruled in between them. Whatever may be the case, one thing is quite clear. After Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman the Gaṅgas enjoyed absolute power. It is likely that they made intrusions into the north-eastern part of the Vishṇukuṇḍi dominions. It is probably to wrest back this occupied area that

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Mādhavavarman IV undertook his eastern campaign in 612 A.D. One may not be sure about who exactly was the Gaṅga opponent of Mādhavavarman IV. Maybe, he was the one, or one of those who ruled in between c. 593 and 624 A.D. As we have already seen, Mādhavavarman IV succeeded in his war against the Gaṅga by conquering the area as far as the Jājpur region, though he died soon after. But the conquest of the Kaliṅga country upto Jājpur must have naturally given a very rude shock to the Gaṅga power. That is perhaps one of the reasons that may go to account for the dark period in the Gaṅga history between c. 593 A.D. and 624 A D.

(iii) THE RĀMAKĀŚYAPAS

The third family the members of which owed allegiance to Vishṇukuṇḍis is that of those chiefs who claimed to belong to the Rāmakāśyapa *gōtra*. As they do not supply any dynastic appellation of them in their records, they may be referred to as Rāmakāśyapas just as the chiefs belonging to the Sālaṅkāyana, Māṭhara, Bṛihatphalāyana, Vāsishṭha and Ānanda *gōtras* are generally known to the historians after their respective *gōtras*. Of the Rāmakāśyapa family we have the following two copperplate charters.

(1) *The Tāṇḍivāḍa Grant* : This charter was issued by the chief Pṛithivīmahārāja from Pishṭapura. The king styles himself as *paramabrahmaṇya* and claims to belong to the Rāmakāśyapa *gōtra*. He is credited with the victory over his *sāmantas* (*i.e.*, neighbouring chiefs or feudatories) and is described as the son of Vikramēndra and the grandson of *Mahārāja* Raṇadurjaya. The charter records the king's gift of the village Tāṇḍivāḍa, made tax-free *agrahāra* in favour of one Bhavaśarman, a member of the Kāmakāyana *gōtra*, a resident of Koṇḍamañchi village, a master of *Trisahasravidyā*, a student of the Sāmavēda, a performer of many sacrifices, a scholar in the *Vēdas*, *Vēdāṅgas*, *Nyāya*, *Upanishad* and *Yōga*, and a commentator on the 'Twenty'.[57] The donee was the son of Pṛithivīśarman, who was a scholar and a teacher of *Trisahasravidyā* and was a son of Vishṇuśarman a scholar in the *śruti* and *smṛiti* literature. The grant village was situated in the Pāguṇāra *vishaya*. The grant is said to have been made for the merit etc. of the donor himself. The *āj̃ñapti* or the executor of the grant was Rāmalēṇṇurāja. The charter is dated in the 15th lunar day of the month Kārttika in the 46th regnal year of the chief.

The place of issue of the record, *viz.*, Pishṭapura, evidently the capital of the king, is the modern Pīṭhāpuram in the East Gōdāvari District. The division Pāguṇāra *vishaya* has been identified by some scholars with the region that roughly comprised the modern Tanuku Taluk. Similarly the grant village Tāṇḍivāḍa has also been identified with the village Tāḍipaṛṛu in the same taluk.[58] According to another view, the above division comprised a larger area that included in itself the Bhimavaram Taluk, the southern fringe of the Tanuku Taluk and the eastern edge of the Kaikaluru Taluk—thus the whole area was bounded by the Kolēru lake in the west and the Gōdavārī in the east. Those who hold this view identify the gift village with Tāḍināḍu in the Kaikaluru Taluk in the Krishna District, and the donee's residential village Koṇḍamañchi with Kōḍamañchili in the adjacent Narasapuram Taluk.[59]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

(2) *The Gōllāvalli Grant* : This charter was also issued by the same Pṛithivīmahārāja, but from his victorious camp evidently of his own army, at Virajōnagara. The introductory portion that describes the chief, his father Vikramēndra and grandfather *Māhārāja* Raṇadurjaya is exactly the same that is found in the previous grant. The charter records the king's gift, made for his own merit and welfare, of the village Gōllāvalli in the Kudrāvaḷi *vishaya* as a tax-free *agrahāra* in favour of a Brāhmaṇa by name Padmaśarman, who was a member of the family of Bhṛigu-*gōtra*, a student of the Taittirīya-*śākhā*, and a scholar in the *Vēdas*, *Vēdāṅgas*, *Purāṇas*, *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Dharmaśāstra*, etc., and was a son of Dāmōdaraśarman and grandson of Mātṛiśarman. As in the previous grant so in the present one also the *āj̃ñapti* was Rāmalēṇṛurāja only. The record is dated on the 8th lunar day of the bright half of the month Jyēshṭha in the 49th regnal year of the king.

The city Virajōnagara wherefrom the chief issued the record has been identified with modern Jājpur in the Cuttack District of Orissa.[60] The names Gōllāvalli of the gift village and Kudrāvaḷi of the territorial division in which the gift village was included remind us respectively of the modern names of the village Galavalli (also spelt Galavilli)[61] in the Bobbili Taluk and Guṭṭavilli in the adjacent Palkonda Taluk, both the taluks being in the Srikakulam District.

Now, as a first step to understand a bit of the history of the Rāmakāśyapas, it may be incompatible for us to fix up the period to which the known members of this family belonged. It is quite clear from the language and contents of the above two charters that Pṛithivīmahārāja was an independent sovereign king who had his capital at Pishṭapura and who held his sway over a territory that extended from the Cuttack District in the north to the Kolēru lake in the south. Again a comparison of characters of the Gōllāvalli and the Tāṇḍivāḍa grants on the one hand and those of the Timmapuram (Vizagapatam District) plates also issued from Pishṭapura by Kubja Vishṇuvardhana[62] on the other, would convince anyone that they are strikingly similar and that the gap in between them could not have been more than 25 years at the most.[63] At the same time, there can be no doubt about that Pishṭapura, captured by Pulakēśi II in 616 A.D., continued to be in the hands of the Chālukyas throughout. Therefore there is no question of assigning Pṛithivīmahārāja of Pishṭapura to a period following the Chālukyan conquest.

Similarly, it is also known that Pishṭapura was well within the Vishṇukuṇḍi dominions as indicated by the Ramatirtham and Kandulapalem plates. One should not, perhaps, venture to assign the chief either to a period of the successful rebellion of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's feudatories sometime before 535 A.D., or to a period between the Kandulapalem plates and the rise of Mādhavavarman IV. For in either case it would widen the gap between the charters of the chief and that of Vishṇuvardhana, by about 90 or 60 years—a gap, which, as has been just now pointed out, is not permitted by the palaeography of the charters. Moreover there is no reason to assume that during either of the above periods the Vishṇukuṇḍi power had been reduced to such a tragically weak position as to enable Pṛithivīmahārāja to annex even the heart of the Vēṅgī kingdom, as his records would show in case they are assigned to a period prior to Mādhavavarman IV. Again during both the periods there was the family of Prithivīmūla ruling over the tract in between Pishṭapura and Vēṅgī.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Similarly during both these periods, as our study in the last section shows, the Gaṅgas were in complete control of the Srikakulam District. Hence, it may not be reasonable to imagine a kingdom of Pṛithivīmahārāja extending up to the Cuttack District during those times.

Moreover, the Polamuru set I indicates that in 612 A.D. the Vishṇukuṇḍi kingdom was quite intact at least upto the Ramachandrapuram Taluk. The description in the record that Mādhavavarman IV had just crossed the Gōdāvarī river with a desire to conquer east clearly reveals that he had not yet started fighting. Had Pṛithivīmahārāja earlier occupied the trans-Gōdāvarī region, the Vishṇukuṇḍi must have already commenced fighting by that date to recover the area. Besides, the scholars believe that the aim of Mādhavavarman IV in his eastern campaign was to take back the area occupied by the Eastern Gaṅgas,[61] and not to conquer Pishṭapura. In view of all these, one may have to assign Pṛithivīmahārāja's independent rule over Pishṭapura to a period in between the date of Polamuru set I, and that of the Māruṭūra grant, *i.e.*, between 612 and 616 A.D. So there appears to be every truth in that the Pishṭapura area was taken by Pulakēśi II from Pṛithivīmahārāja.[65]

How the family of the Rāmakāśyapas came to power we do not know. It has been tentatively suggested earlier that by curbing the power of the Māṭharas, Pitṛibhaktas etc., of the area Mādhavavarman II might have established on the throne of Pishṭapura his own protege probably of the Rāmakāśyapa family. The *gōtra*-name Rāmakāśyapa reminds us of the Tāmrakāśyapa *gōtra* to which belonged a line of chiefs who were ruling sometime in the 6th century, over Punnāḍ, *i.e.*, a small territory west of Talakāḍ in Karnataka State. These rulers had matrimonial alliance with the Gaṅgas of Talakāḍ, and the king Durvinīta Gaṅga (540-60 A.D.) is believed to be a product of one such marriage.[66] In that Tāmrakāśyapa family as well as in the family of the Western Gaṅgas the name Pṛithivīpati is often met with. Now the name of Pṛithivīmahārāja and the *gōtra* name Rāmakāśyapa of his give rise to a doubt whether his family represents a branch of the above Punnāḍ family. In that case, one may believe that just like the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga and their Kadamba feudatories also of Kaliṅga represented some off-shoots of the families of the same names belonging to the area in the present Karnataka State, in the same way the family of the Rāmakāśyapas of Pishṭapura also may be a branch of the said feudal family of Punnāḍ.

It has been admitted already that the Rāmakāśyapas stood on a feudal relation to the Vishṇukuṇḍis. This is propped up by the fact that Pṛithivīmahārāja's father had the name Vikramēndra, a name which is met with in the Vishṇukuṇḍi family alone. It may also be supported by the contemporaneity of the Rākamāśyapas of Pishṭapura with the Vishṇukuṇḍi rulers. For, as Pṛithivīmahārāja's 46th or 49th regnal year fell about 616 A.D., he must have come to power sometime about 570 A.D., or 567 A D. and must have reigned contemporaneously with Mādhavavarman IV. Similarly his father Vikramēndra might have ruled during 545-70 A.D. as a vassal of the Vishṇukuṇḍi Vikramēndravarman II. Then it would follow that Pṛithivīmahārāja's grandfather Raṇadurjaya's suzerain was Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman.[67]

It may be stated that the title *Mahārāja* of Raṇadurjaya perhaps indicates that he might have proclaimed independence following the defeat of Indrabhaṭṭārakava-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

rman by the confederacy of the chiefs, or more probably earlier during the period of the weak rule of Vikramēndravarman I. The records shed no light on any achievement of this king. The name Raṇadurjaya occurs twice in the list of the early kings of the family of the Veḷanāṇḍu chiefs who claim to belong to the fourth caste.[68] It is likely that the name Raṇadurjaya might have been borrowed from the Rāmakāśyapas by the Veḷanāṇḍu family.[69] Raṇadurjaya's son and successor was Vikramēndra. The latter is not endowed with any title like *Mahārāja* or even *Rājan*, though he is said to be a very rich king. Probably it signifies that the family was once again reduced to complete subjucation and to vassalage by Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. Vikramēndra's son and successor was Pṛithivīmahārāja. As we saw in the last chapter, this chief too remained perhaps as a vassal of the Vishṇukuṇḍis for a long time and probably followed his master Mādhavavarman IV in the latter's Kaliṅga campaigns.[70] When some unknown calamity overtook the suzerain, Pṛithivīmahārāja proclaimed himself as an independent sole monarch of the departed master's vast territory from Jājpur to the Kolēru lake. Therefore scholars seem to be on the right side when they observe that "Pṛithivīmahārāja asserted full independence about the end of his career when the Vishṇukuṇḍi power declined as a result of many wars".[71]

One cannot be sure whether in the process of the take-over of the Vishṇukuṇḍi kingdom, Pṛithivīmahārāja had to put down a Vishṇukuṇḍi prince who might have been imbecile. It is also not known whether Pṛithivīmahārāja put an end to the feudal family of Pṛithivīmūla. At any rate, it is almost clear that it was Pṛithivīmahārāja who was stripped of Pishṭapura by the Chālukya Pulakēśi II. The theory of the Chālukyan take-over of Pishṭapura from Pṛithivīmūla (of the Godavari plates) alleged to be a grandson of Pṛithivīmahārāja[72] is difficult to maintain in the light of the facts examined so far. When Pulakēśi II wrested the kingdom of Pishṭapura from Pṛithivīmahārāja, automatically the former became the master of the latter's territory that extended down to the Kolēru lake. That is why in the process of completing his conquest of the east coast Pulakēśi II, immediately after his capture of Pishṭapura, was necessitated to fight on the bank of the Kolēru with Pṛithivīyuvarāja a vassal of Pallava Mahēndravarman I as we shall see later. What happened to Pṛithivīmahārāja after his defeat at Pishṭapura is beyond what one can now be sure of. Yet if his 49th regnal year (*i.e.*, of his Gālāvalli grant) fell after 616 A.D. (*i.e.*, of the Māruṭūra grant of Pulakēśi II) then it may indicate one probability. Being driven out from Pishṭapura in 616 A.D., the chief continued his activities for sometime in the northern part of the kingdom, he had newly carved out. However the Gaṅgas must have started before long asserting themselves in the area as we have seen in the last section.

Before concluding, it may be noted that the names Pṛithivīmahārāja and Pṛithivīyuvarāja of the above mentioned chiefs are strikingly similar. It is also equally striking that both of them tried to make best use of the situation created by the sudden collapse of the Vishṇukuṇḍi house and both had held their respective regions in the Vēṅgī country perhaps with a common border, *viz.*, the Kolēru lake. It is also noteworthy that the Chālukya Pulakēśi II had to fight with the one immediately after he vanquished the other. If all these do not go to make a series of mere coincidences,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

then they may indicate some relationship between the families of the two. Such a relationship between the feudatory of the Vishṇukuṇḍis with a vassal of the Pallavas may not be incongruous especially in view of the possibility of such a relationship existing between the families of the overlords themselves, as we saw in the last chapter.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. MDG, *Gōdāvari*, Vol. I, p. 1, n., and pp. 217, 220.
2. JBBRAS, XVI, p. 115. See also ASVOI, Vol. I, No. iii, pp. 87ff.
3. The suggestion that the writer of the Godavari plates (I) has here skillfully indicated a complete failure of the confederacy against Indrabhaṭṭāraka (ASVOI. I, No. iii. p. 90) is not convincing.
4. For the four necessaries of the *bhikshus* daily life see PED, s.v. *pachchaya*.
5. This expression as well as its shorter form *navakarmika* have a technical import, *i.e.*, a monk in charge of the act of erection, dedication etc., of the Buddhist buildings. See EI. XX, p. 30; Edgerton, *Bud. Hyb. Skt. Dict.*, s.v.; IC. XV, p. 232.
6. The expression is *sva-pratishṭhāpita*.
7. Cf. APGAS, No. 6, p. 243.
8. The names Pṛithivīmūla, Mūla etc. of the family reminds us of the name Chantamula (Skt. Śāntamūla) of the Ikshvāku dynasty and the names Mahāmula, Chulamula, Mulavaṇija, Mula etc. of the inscriptions of that dynasty (EI, XX, pp. 22-23).
9. MDG, (op. cit), p. 220.
10. Above Ch. V, sect. i.
11. See No. XII.
12. No. XVII, and the three sets of the Gudivada plates of the king. (EI, XXXI, pp. 129 ff.) Cf also the Western Chālukya titles *Vallabha, Śrīvallabha, Śrīpṛithivīvallabha*.
13. For a good deal of speculations centring around the names Supratīka and Kumuda of the elephants see JBBRAS, XVI, p. 116 ; EI, IV, p. 195 ; ASVOI, Vol. I, No. iii, p. 90 ; QJMS, XXX, p. 325 ; CA, p. 210 ; etc.
14. SII, II, pp. 361 ff.
15. Ibid., p. 368, line 62.
16. There is no ground for the assumption that Pṛithivīmūla was slain by Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's son Vikramēndravarman (Cf. ED, p. 500).
17. See sect. iii below.
18. Above Ch. VI, sect. ii.
19. There has been a long controversy on the epoch of the Gaṅga era. For different views on this question, see e.g. EI, XXVI, p. 326 ; XXVII, p. 192 ; XXXI, pp. 46 ff; XXXIII, pp. 101 ff.
20. They are the following :
    (*i*) The Godavari plates (I) of Pṛithivīmūla, No. XI.
    (*ii*) The Jirjingi plates of Indravarman I, year 39 (c. 535 A.D.) No. XIII.
    (*iii*) The Ponnuturu plates of Mahāsāmantavarman, year 64 (c. 560 A.D.), EI, XXVII, p. 216 ff.
    (*iv*) The Narasingapalli plates of Hastivarman, year 79 (c. 575 A.D.), EI, XXIII, pp, 62 ff.
    (*v*) The Urlam plates of Hastivarman, year 80 (c. 576 A.D.), EI, XVII, pp. 332 ff.
    (*vi*) The Achyutapuram plates of Indravarman II Rājasiṁha, year 87 (c.583 A.D.), EI, III, pp. 128 ff.
    (*vii*) The Śanta-Bommali plates of Indravarman II Rājasiṁha, year 87 (c. 583 A.D.), JAHRS, IV, pp. 21 ff.
    (*viii*) The Tirlingi fragmentary copper-plate charter, year 88 (?) (c. 584 A.D.), JAHRS, III, pp. 54ff. This charter has been wrongly attributed to Mitavarman ibid. VI, p. 71). But in fact it belongs to the time of Indravarman II Rājasiṁha only. See Bhandarkar's List No. 2047 and n. and p. 386.
    (*ix*) The Parlaikimedi plates of Indravarman II Rājasiṁha, year 91 (c.587 A.D.), IA, XVI, pp. 131ff.
    (*x*) The Urjam plates of Indravarman II, year 97 (c. 593 A.D.), EI, XXXVII, pp. 159 ff. The next known Gaṅga charter in the chronological order is the Chicacole plates of Indravarman III, year 128 (c. 624 A.D.) (IA, XIII, pp. 120 ff.) Its date falls beyond our purview.
21. See above sect. i.
22. JBBRAS, XVI, p. 116 ; BG, p. 334.
23. See above n. 20.
24. SS, p. 114. See also CA, 216.
25. EHD, p. 473.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

26. ASVOI, I, pt. iii. pp. 89-90 ; CA, p. 216.
27. APGAS, No. 10, p. 17.
28. *Yājña.* I, verse 39.
29. MG, II, pt. ii, p. 592 ; H.K. Mahatab, *The Hist. of Orissa,* I, pp. 111.
30. Bhandarkar's List, p. 386, n. 5.
31. The record does not indicate that Indra, the son of Mitavarman reigned at Maṇalkuḍi as believed by some (AHD, p. 93).
32. SII, II, p. 368, lines 60 61.
33. TPCP, pp. 123-24. For other conflicting views on the identification of Maṇṇaikkuḍi see KESIH, p. 175.
34. MG, II, pt. ii, p. 587.
35. CA, pp. 215, 268.
36. See CHI, I, p. 173; CA, p. 382.
37. For conflicting views on this topic see EI, XXV, pp. 285-86.
38. See EI, XIV, p. 361 ; JAHRS, VI, 73, n. 10 ; Sylvain Levi etc., *Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian India,* trans. by P.C. Bagchi, p. 171.
39. For different views on the subject see EI, XXV, p. 286 ; CA, p. 215 ; etc.
40. Above Ch. V, sect. ii.
41. Cf. the axiom *Tan-madhya-patitas=tad-grahaṇēna gṛihyatē.*
42. See below, sect. iii.
43. CA, pp. 215.
44. Ibid., p. 269.
45. Ibid., p. 215.
46. See above Ch. V, sect. iii.
47. See EI, XIV, pp. 361 ff., where the date of the record has been read as *149.* For the reading *137,* see EI, XVIII, p. 308; CA, p. 216.
48. See above n. 20.
49. CA, p. 215.
50. See above n. 20.
51. CA, p. 216.
52. EI, XXIII, p. 65.
53. See above n. 20.
54. CA, p. 216.
55. See EI, XXXVII, p. 161.
56. See above n. 20.
57. See below Ch. X, sect. ii.
58. EI, XXIII, p. 97.
59. ED, pp. 551-52.
60. ARE, 1955-56, p. 3; EI, XXXV, p. 222.
61. This village has yielded two Eastern Gaṅga copper plate charters of the later period. See EI, XXXI, pp. 187 ff.
62. See EI, IX, plate facing p. 318.
63. R.S. Panchamukhi has rightly and convincingly assigned the characters of the Tāṇḍivāḍa grant to the beginning of the 7th century (EI, XXIII, p. 88. Cf. ARE, 1917, p. 132). S.C. De proposed to assign the alphabets of the Gōllāvalli grant to the last quarter of the 6th century (EI, XXXV, p. 221) and Dr. Sircar would not subscribe to this view (ibid., n. 3).
64. EI, XXIII, p. 94; ED, 527ff; CA, p. 225. The untenability of the theory according to which the eastern expedition of Mādhavavarman IV indirectly refers to his struggle with the Maukhari Īśānavarman has already been pointed out (Ch. V, sect. iii).
65. ARE, 1955-56, p. 3 ; EI. XXIII, p. 96.
66. MAR, 1917, p. 40 ; AHD, p. 109.
67. Cf JMU, XXXVIII, pp. 254ff.
68. See the Pithapuram Inscr. of the Velanaṇḍu chief Pṛithivīśvara, EI, IV, pp. 39ff. verses 2, 7-8.
69. ARE, 1917, pp. 132-33. For the view that Raṇadurjaya of the Tāṇḍivāḍa grant was a Chōḷa whose ancestors had settled in the Eastern Deccan, see EI, XXIII, p. 97.
70. In the light of the Vishṇukuṇḍi chronology and genealogy followed by us it is hardly possible to agree to the view, that Pṛithivīmahārāja might have accompanied Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman in the latter's eastern campaign (ARE, 1955-56, p. 3). Similarly nor can one subscribe to the theory that Pṛithivīmahārāja overthrew Vikramēndravarman II and put an end to the Vishṇukuṇḍi rule (APGAS, No. 10, p. 17).
71. ARE, 1955-56, p. 3.
72. CA, pp. 214-15.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CHAPTER VIII

ADVENT OF NEW POWER

EARLIER it has been said that within a generation since the date of the Polamuru set I, the Vēṅgī country, the heart of the Vishṇukuṇḍi dominions, was completely under the effective rule of the Chālukyas. Therefore, for all practical purposes the Chālukyas may be looked upon as successors of the Vishṇukuṇḍis in the Vēṅgī country. How the former succeeded in subjugating the country be studied in this chapter.

(i) SOURCES

We have got the following three records that have bearing on the history of the period.

(1) *The Māruṭūra Grant* : This charter is of the Chālukya king Satyāśraya Pṛithivīvallabha, who is to be identified with Pulakēśi II of Bādāmi as we shall see subsequently. In the introductory part of the record the king is described only in a general way and no particular achievement, either political or otherwise, is attributed to him. Many of the epithets of the monarch are the adapted forms of those found in the descriptions of his father Kīrttivarman and his paternal uncle Maṅgaḷēśa in the latter's epigraphs. The present charter records the king's gift of the village Māruṭūra together with Natāvaṭa and Vattipaṟu in favour of some eleven Brāhmaṇas and to one person not belonging to the three castes (*varṇṇa-traya-nivṛitta*). The names, *gōtras* and the educational achievements of all the twelve are given. Some of the Brāhmaṇa donees were well versed in the Four Vēdas, some had mastered Eighty-*tarkas* (logics) and some others Thousand-*tarkas*.[1] The details of the date of the grant are given as the eighth regnal year of the king, Jyēshṭha ba. 15, solar eclipse.

It is said that at the time of issue of the charter the monarch was camping at Kalūrapura immediately after destroying and capturing Pishṭapura. Further we are told here that the king made this grant with a view to help the seniormost queen, evidently of his, by name Kadambā, in fulfilling her desire to gratify her *guru* (father). At the same time the king is also stated to have made the same gift for the *akshayya-phala* or imperishable result (*i.e.*, *mōksha*) of a certain Ālukamahārāja, who had come all the way from Maṅgalapura to Kalūra for the sake of the donor, foregoing all his comforts, enjoyment and the administration of his kingdom and paying no heed to the troubles of travel and stay in the highly dangerous (*vishamatara*), plundered (*vikṛitshṭa*) and desolate (*a-dhvāna*) foreign country and to the difficulties of returning back and who had attained godhood (died) at Kalūra.[2]

Of all the Chālukyan kings who styled themselves as Satyāśraya Pṛithivīvallabha, Pulakēśi II alone is known to have subjucated Pishṭapura and to have invaded the Vēṅgī country.[3] Therefore, the issuer of the charter is to be identified with that king.[4] His chief queen Kadambā is not known from any other source.[5] The chief

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Āḷukamahārāja, who came from Maṅgalapura to Kalūrapura and died there, was certainly a member of the Āḷupa[6] dynasty of the Tuḷuva country (South Kanara). One Sakalaśrīmat Āḷuvarasa of the dynasty has been referred to in c. 600 A.D.[7] If this is correct, then the said Āḷukamahārāja of the present record may be identified tentatively with that king or his successor. From the tenor of the charter under study it is almost certain that the above Āḷuka king was the *guru* (*i.e.*, father)[8] of the queen Kadambā and that he came to Kalūra to assist his overlord, *i.e.*, Pulakēśi II, in his campaigns in the Eastern Deccan,[9] and died at Kalūra, perhaps in a battle.

Pishṭapura of the record is the modern Pīṭhāpuram in the East Godavari District. The destruction and capture of this city by Pulakēśi II is already known to us from the Aihole *praśasti* of that king. Some writers have identified the place of camp of Pulakēśi II, *viz.*, Kalūra or Kalūrapura, and the grant village Māruṭūra respectively with the modern Kollūr and Māruṭūru both in the Guntur District.[10] However, in the Aihole *praśasti* we are told that after the capture of Pishṭapura, Pulakēśi II had to fight a fierce battle near the Kolēru lake—a fact not referred to in the present record. So, it is reasonable to think that at the time of the issue of the present charter the Chālukya ruler was yet to fight and win that battle. Besides, as will be shown later, Pulakēśi II had to come personally once again, in about 631 A.D., on a separate campaign to conquer the Guntur region to the south of the Kṛishṇā.[11] Therefore it is very likely that the name Kalūrapura in our record, where Pulakēśi II was camping at the time of the issue of the charter immediately after reducing Pishṭapura, has connection with the Kolēru lake. May be, it was a place somewhere on the bank of that lake in the West Godavari District. Perhaps it was this place, wherefrom the Eastern Chālukya Jayasiṁha issued his Gudivada plates (set I) in his 18th year.[12] The gift village Māruṭūra may be identified with the present Māruṭēru in the Tanuku Taluk in the same district. Again the two other geographical units, *viz.*, Nātavāṭa and Vattipaṛu, gifted along with Māruṭūra may be identical respectively with the modern Nādupūḍi, about 6 or 7 miles to the east of Māruṭēru, and with Vadura, just adjacent to the said Māruṭēru. Some scholars are inclined to identify Maṅgalapura of the record with Maṅgalagiri again in the Guntur District.[13] But the tone of the record indicates, beyond any possible doubt, that the place under question was the home of the Āḷupa king and it was far removed from Kalūra. Therefore it may better be identified with the present Mangalore, in the Āḷupa country in the South Kanara District.[14] The details of the date of the record seem to correspond to 616 A.D., May 21, Friday.[15]

(2) *The Aihole Praśasti* : This *praśasti*, though not coming from the Vēṅgī country is directly connected with the history of the area during the period. It is dated in Śaka 556 expired (634-35 A.D.), corresponding to the year 3735 since the Bhārata war (*i.e.*, Kali era). The 27th and 28th verses of the *praśasti* gives a vivid picture of how Pulakēśi II pounded and captured Pishṭapura and how he fought a fierce battle of elephants and infantry somewhere on the bank of the Kunāla *i.e.* Kolēru lake.[16] The relevant portion reads :

Pishṭaṁ Pishṭapuraṁ yēna jātaṁ durggam=adurggamam ।
chiraṁ yasya Kalēr=vvṛittaṁ jātaṁ durggama-durggamam ॥

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Sannaddha-vāraṇaghaṭā-sthagit-āntarālaṁ
nān-āyudha-kshata-nara-kshataj-āṅga-rāgam /
āsīj=jalaṁ yad-avamardditam=abhra-garbhaṁ
Kaunālam=ambaram=iv=ōdita-sāndhya-rāgam ||[17]

(3) *The Polamuru Plates Set II* : The language of this record closely follows that of the Polamuru plates set I. The present charter was issued by Pṛithivī-Jayasiṁha *i.e.* Jayasiṁha I, the son and successor of Kubja Vishṇuvardhana who was the first king of the Eastern Chālukya dynasty. It records a gift, as a *Sarvasiddhidatti*, of the village Pulōmbūru in the Guddavādi *vishaya* in favour of the Brāhmaṇa Rudraśarman of the Taittirīya school and of the Gautama *gōtra*. The donee is further described as a grandson of Dāmaśarman, as a son of Śivaśarman, as a resident of the *sthāna* (i.e., *ghaṭikāsthāna*[18]) in Asanapura, and as the former owner of the *agrahāra* (*purvāgrahārika*), evidently of Pulōmbūru itself. As in the case of the Polamuru set I so in the case of this charter also the officials *Hastikōśa* and *Vīrakōśa* figure as the executors of the grant. The charter is dated in the third day of the eighth fortnight of the Summer season in the fifth regnal year of the monarch.

There cannot be any doubt that this charter, studied together with the Polamuru set I, reveals the following facts : The grant villages of both the records are identical ; the donee Rudraśarman's father Śivaśarman of the present charter was identical with the donee of the same name of the other ; and in fact, the present charter only restored, as indicated by the epithet *pūrvāgrahārika* of the donee, the original grant of the other one, which must have fallen into disuse in the meantime evidently due to the political upheavel in the area during the period. From the above, it is also fairly clear that the interval between these two charters could not have been much more than a generation. Yet to fix up the actual year of issue of the present charter is little problematic. For, though the Eastern Chālukyan records are unanimous in assigning 18 years of rule to Jayasiṁha's father Kubja Vishṇuvardhana, scholars widely differ from each other regarding the year of commencement of Vishṇuvardhana's reign period. Accordingly the 18 year of rule of that monarch have been taken differently by different scholars *viz.*, 615-33 A D.,[19] 624-41 A.D.[20] and 633-50 A.D.[21]

However, because the Polamuru set I is to be placed in 612 A.D.,[22] and because the gap between the dates of these two sets of Polamuru plates could not have been much more than a generation, it would be much better if the reign of Vishṇuvardhana is assigned to a period c. 616-33 A.D. This suggestion is supported by the fact that, as we shall see subsequently, soon after his victory in the battle of the Kolēru in 616 A.D. Pulakēśi II entrusted the administration of Vēṅgī to his brother Vishṇuvardhana.[23] Therefore it is not unreasonable to equate the fifth year of his son Jayasiṁha with c. 637-38 or 638-39 A.D. (616+18+5), a year which is removed from the year of the Polamuru set I only by about 26 or 27 years. It may also be seen that even if the reign period of Vishṇuvardhana is assigned to 624 - 41 A.D., the fifth year of Jayasiṁha would correspond to 645-46 A.D. *i.e.*, just 33 or 34 years from the date of the Polamuru set I.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

(ii) CHĀLUKYAN OCCUPATION OF VĒṄGĪ

We have already referred to the rise of the Chālukyan power under Pulakēśi I (c. 535-66 A.D.) a junior contemporary of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. He was succeed ed by his son Kīrttivarman in 566 A.D., *i.e.*, the year in which Vikramēndravarman II issued his Tummalagudem plates (set II). Kīrttivarman was succeeded by his younger brother Maṅgaḷēśa in 597-98 A.D. who, as we already saw, ruled till 608 A.D., *i.e.*, more or less contemporaneously with Mādhavavarman IV. The Chālukyan inscriptions credit both Kīrttivarman and Maṅgaḷēśa with extensive conquests. Thus the former is said to have won victories over the rulers of Vaṅga, Aṅga, Kaliṅga, Vaṭṭura, Magadha, Madraka, Kēraḷa, Gaṅga, Mūshaka, Pāṇḍya, Dramiḷa, Chōḷiya, Āḷuka and Vaijayantī and to have destroyed the Nalas, the Mauryas and the Kadambas. Similarly, Maṅgaḷēśa is also credited with the victory over the Kaṭachchuris and the conquest of the Rēvatīdvīpa.[24] It is significant that even these tall claims and exaggerated lists of countries and rulers over whom the Chālukyan kings claim to have won victory do not refer even once to the name of Andhra or Vēṅgī or the Vishṇukuṇḍis in the immediate neighbourhood. It may not be wrong if this fact is taken to be a proof in the negative indicating a probability of some sort of friendly relationship between the Chālukyas and the Vishṇukuṇḍis of the period. A possibility of Pulakēśi I (or his son Kīrttivarman) joining the Vishṇukuṇḍi Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman against the Maukhari and the Nala kings, has already been referred to.[25] Moreover the last mentioned Vishṇukuṇḍi ruler, as we saw earlier, was perhaps the earliest of the known kings to bear the title *Satyāśraya* which many Chālukya rulers, since the days of Pulakēśi I himself, were very particular to assume. Again the *biruda* and the name of *Satyāśraya* Dhruvarāja Indravarman of the Goa plates (610 or 611 A.D.), whose place in the Chālukyan genealogy is yet to be finalised satisfactorily,[26] recall those of *Satyāśraya* Indravarman, the Vishṇukuṇḍi. All these may support the probability of some friendly relationship between these two families.

Maṅgaḷēśa died in c. 608.A.D.The Aihole *praśasti* furnishes a picturesque description of the anarchy and confusion that ensued his death. At that time, the *praśasti* says, taking advantage of the general confusion of the time, one Appāyika and a certain Gōvinda—the latter with a sizable army of elephants—jointly ventured to capture the Chālukyan territory to the north of the river Bhīmā. The *praśasti* goes on to say that Pulakēśi, evidently following the *bhēdōpāya*, defeated and drove away Appāyika but made friendship with Gōvinda and amply rewarded him for the help he had rendered to the Chālukya. The verse under question runs :

Labdhvā kālaṁ bhayam=upagatē jētum=Appāyik-ākhyē
Gōvindē cha dvirada-nikarair=uttarāṁ Bhīmarathyāḥ ।
yasy=ānīkair=yudhi bhaya-rasajñatvam=ēkaḥ prayātaḥ
tatr=āvāptaṁ phalam=upakṛitasy=āparēṇ=āpi sadyaḥ ॥ (Verse 17)

It is not possible to identify Appāyika in the present state of our knowledge. Regarding the identification of Gōvinda of the above verse scholars entertain conflicting theories. Some have proposed to identify him with his namesake, the great grandfather of the Rāshṭrakūṭa Dantidurga (742-57 A.D).[27] However, as Dr. Fleet had rightly pointed out,[28] that Rāshṭrakūṭa did not enjoy any regal position and is hardly referable to a period as early as c. 608 A.D. To the period under question

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

some writers[29] assign the Rāshṭrakūṭa chief named Gōvinda who figures as the grandfather of the Rāshṭrakūṭa Nannarāja in the latter's Tiwarkhed (Betul District, C.P.) plates,[30] believed to be dated in Śaka 553. But that record is taken to be spurious.[31] Even otherwise, the text of the unsatisfactorily worded date-portion of the said record probably indicates Śaka 653[32] (731-32 A.D.) and not Śaka 553 as the date of the record. Therefore that Gōvinda too cannot be assigned to the beginning of the 7th century.[33] Another school of thought is that Gōvinda of the Aihole *praśasti* was a mere military adventurer with no claim of royalty.[34] However, the fact that he had a strong army of elephants and that the shrewed conqueror Pulakēśi found it more convenient to come to a compromise with this Gōvinda alone and rewarded him in recognition of the help rendered (either by himself or more probably by his predecessors) does not seem to support that contention. Thus the problem of identifying Gōvinda of the *praśasti* remains yet to be solved.

However, without giving any reason Fleet suggested that this Gōvinda must have been a Rāshṭrakūṭa.[35] It may be probably because he was not aware of any other dynasty of the period that had kings of that name. But, now it is known well that the name Gōvinda was popular in the family of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. We have also already seen that the dominions of the Vishṇukuṇḍis were just on the eastern side of the Bhīmā river,[36] and that the kings there had organised a strong army of elephants.[37] Therefore one may suggest tentatively that Gōvinda of the Aihole *praśasti* might have been a Vishṇukuṇḍi prince, perhaps, as the period indicates, a son of Mādhavavarman IV. The prince was probably named after his own grandfather, *i.e.*, Gōvindavarman II. Maybe, this Vishṇukuṇḍi prince, being tempted by the troubled conditions of the Chālukyan kingdom, set aside the traditional friendly policy towards the Chālukyas and tried to garb some territory of the latter, but in vain. As the *praśasti* tells us, he had to bow before the diplomacy of Pulakēśi. Obviously the policy of friendship was revived. Therefore here in the Aihole *praśasti* there may be a reference to a son of Mādhavavarman IV, not known so far from any other source. Similarly, if the above friendly relationship between the Chālukya and the Vishṇukuṇḍi were referred to in the *praśasti*, then it may very well explain how Mādhavavarman IV could embark upon his eastern campaign as late as 612 A.D.,[38] without the least apprehension of the formidable Chālukya growing stronger day by day just in the western neighbourhood.

Crushing down the rebels with iron hand and tact, Pulakēśi II soon brought the civil war to an end, and established himself firmly in Bādāmi[39] as evidenced by his own Hyderabad plates. Then he set out on a *digvijaya*. The Satara plates issued by Kubja Vishṇuvardhana in the eighth regnal year of Pulakēśi (*i.e.*, the year when the latter was engaged in the Andhra conquest and issued the Māruṭūra grant) are clear enough to indicate that while starting on his foreign conquest Pulakēśi made his younger brother Vishṇuvardhana a *yuvarāja* and entrusted to him, the administration of the home country.[40] The Aihole *praśasti* gives a grandiloquent account of the triumphal campaigns of Pulakēśi II. It narrates (verses 20-26) how he overthrew the Mauryas of Koṅkaṇ; subdued the Lāṭas, the Mālavas and the Gurjaras; won a spectacular victory over the mightly Harshavardhana of the north; acquired the sovereignty over the three Mahārāshṭrakas ; and humbled the Kaliṅgas and Kōsalas. As we already saw, the next two verses of the *praśasti* tell us how he pounded and

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

captured Pishṭapura, fought, and also perhaps won with considerable difficulty a pitched battle on the bank of the Kolēru lake. The Māruṭūra grant issued by Pulakēśi II himself from his camp near that lake immediately after the capture of Pishṭapura corroborates the above statement of the Aihole *praśasti*. As a result of these two-fold victories, a sizable portion of the Eastern Deccan passed under the Chālukyan conqueror. The chief Pṛithivīmahārāja seems to have been ruling from Pishṭapura sometime in 612-16 A.D. as we saw earlier.[41] Therefore it is certain that from him Pulakēśi snatched away Pishṭapura before he conquered the Kṛishṇā-Gōdāvarī doab.

Regarding the date of Pulakēśi's conquest of Vēṅgī, scholars entertain contradictory opinions. The dates that had been suggested in this connection are c. 609 A.D., 610 A.D., 611 A.D., 610-15 A.D., 615 A.D., 617-20 A.D., and c. 631 A.D.[42] However the Māruṭūra grant dated in 616 A.D., fully testifies the view of Dr. Fleet who, as early as 1891, with his remarkable insight into the history and chronology of the period, has assigned the event to 616 or 617 A.D.[43]

Similarly regarding the identity of the person by conquering whom near the Kolēru, Pulakēśi II subjugated the Vēṅgi country scholars differ from one another widely. When Dr. Fleet wrote in 1891, the dynasty of the Vishṇukuṇḍis was unknown and the Māṅgaḷūru grant of the Pallava Siṁhavarman was found to indicate the Pallava occupation of the Vēṅgī country.[44] Naturally, therefore, the above scholar held that the Vēṅgī country was taken away by the Chālukya king from the Pallavas.[45] This seems to have been also supported by the Aihole *praśasti* itself speaking of the Pallava-Chālukya conflict along with the description of the Chālukyan conquest of Vēṅgī. However, after the discovery of the Vishṇukuṇḍi charters scholars are unanimous in taking the Chālukyas as the political successors of the Vishṇukuṇḍis in Vēṅgī. We have already examined in great detail the contrary views of the writers on this question. Now in view of what we have studied so far it may be concluded that no member of the Vishṇukuṇḍi family is heard of after 612 A.D. It seems, therefore, that in that year or very soon after, Mādhavavarman IV must have died without leaving any able successor to shoulder the responsibility of the kingdom and consequently the country was plunged into confusion and chaos.[46] In this connection it is quite significant that the Māruṭūra grant of Pulakēśi II characterises the country where he was camping (*i.e.*, Vēṅgī) as 'an extremely dangerous and desolated land given to plunder (*vishamatara-vikṛisht-ādhvāna*)'—a description that amply vouches for the general chaotic conditions prevalent in the region during the period under question.[47] The cumulative effect of these evidences may indicate that the powerful dynasty of the Vishṇukuṇḍis had just disappeared from the political arena of the Andhra country and that no king or dynasty worth the name had yet been successful enough to establish itself firmly in the area. Therefore it may not be wrong to suggest that Pulakēśi II invaded the Vēṅgī country, taking the fullest advantage of the political confusion and unstability that must have ensued the sudden collapse of the powerful Vishṇukuṇḍi house round about 612 A.D.

(iii) PULAKĒŚI II AND PṚITHIVĪYUVARĀJA

The battle on the bank of the Kolēru lake, fought by Pulakēśi II in May 616

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

A.D., immediately after capturing Pishṭapura, perhaps decided the Chālukya's success in subjugating the Kṛishṇā-Gōdāvarī doab. As the course of events show, Pulakēśi won that battle. However his Māruṭūra grant is clear enough to suggest that in the battle he lost Ālukamahārāja, perhaps his faithful general and father-in-law. We have already referred to the Chezerla inscription in which certain Pṛithivīyuvarāja, a feudatory of the Pallava Mahēndravarman I figures. In that record the said chief claims to have destroyed the armies of the enemies near the Kolēru lake. Therefore it is very likely that the Chālukyan monarch, though a powerful expansionist, was clever enough to realise it not expedient to cross the Kṛishṇā and to march further south at that time. However, in 631 A.D., he revisited the east coast and completed his conquest of the region. On this aspect of the history of Vēṅgī the following two important inscriptions bear witness :

(1) *The Chezerla Inscription* : This, inscription is engraved on two sides of a stone slab set up in the Kapōtēśvara temple in the village Chēzerla. When the record was discovered in 1899 and reported in 1900, both the sides of the slab were believed to bear one and the same inscription.[48] However, perhaps because the epigraph is very much obliterated, particularly in the lower parts of the stone and perhaps also because no link was found to connect the texts engraved on its two sides, Sri K.V. Subrahmanya Aiyer, the first editor of the record (in 1928) published the texts on two sides separately.[49] However, that scholar had an opportunity to examine the epigraph *in situ*.[50] Hence, he maintained that the records on both the sides of the stone, are "materially connected with one another", and "written in the same script", "almost in the same hand".[51] Therefore he may be right in treating them as a single record.[52] Now there are other reasons also to believe that the text on the second face is in continuation of that on the first.[53] Therefore, it is certain that the slab contains a single record only engraved on both the sides of it.

The palaeography of the epigraph is very much similar to that of the Aihole *praśasti* of Pulakēśi II,[54] and of the Dharmarajaratha inscriptions at Mahābalipuram,[55] resembling palaeographically the inscriptions of Pallava Mahēndravarman I.[56] One notable feature in the Chezerla record is that the *visargas* are often denoted not by two dots, one above the other, but by a vertical line with ends slightly thickened, as in the Dharmarajaratha inscriptions. Similarly the letter *dh*, *v* etc., are more of the Pallava type than of the Chālukyan type. On consideration of these features the Chezerla record may be attributed to the age of the above mentioned epigraphs, *i.e.*, the first half of the 7th century.[57]

The record definitely falls into four parts.[58] The first part[59] introduces the chief Pṛithivīyuvarāja as camping at the lake Kōlissaras, *i.e.*, on the bank of it, and as the son of the daughter of Kandararāja. The second part, *i.e.*, the grant portion,[60] seems to record the chief's grant of a tax-free village and perhaps a temple, and also the restoration by him of some original gifts in favour of the god Achalēśvara also known as Kapōtēśvara, apparently to meet the expenses of the worship in the temple. The grant was made for the victory, strength, longevity, health, etc., of the lineage of the donor's son (*sva-sut-ānvaya*). The third part[61] seems to refer to the rule of the *Mahārāja Avanibhājana* Mahēndravikrama and prabably bears the details of the date of the record in the regnal year of that king, now unfortunately lost almost completely.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

The fourth or concluding part[62] refers to some twelve officers of the temple of Kapōtēśvara and a merchant. Probably the gift was entrusted to them. At the end a learned person, name lost, seems to be referred to, presumably as the composer of the text of the record.

According to the inscription, the chief Kandararāja was born of the great family of Ānandamaharshi and was the lord of the city Kandarapura, of some two *janapadas* or provinces and of the river Sitētara-Beṇṇā (*i.e.*, the Kṛishṇa-Beṇṇā or Kṛishṇā) in which the Andhra ladies took bath.[63] He had the title *Trikūṭa-parvata-pati* and his victorious banner had in it (the representation of) the *gōlāṅgūla* or a species of monkey. His beloved daughter was the great queen Avanitalāntavatī to whom was born the chief named Pṛithivīyuvarāja.[64] The last mentioned chief is endowed with a long chain of epithets and some of them are not fully preserved. From a few noteworthy titles of him we learn this : Pṛithivīyuvarāja was residing at, or governing (*adhitishṭhan*) over, the place of the above Kandararāja. He had an excellent army of elephants (*vāraṇ-ōttama-bala*). His charters had, evidently on their seals, the representation of Muraripu (*i.e.*, Vishṇu) mounted on Garuḍa.[65] He was the lord of the highly prosperous villages (*pallī*) and provinces (*janapada*)[66] and was bent upon vanquishing the most powerful. His banner had on it the figure of the vulture (*gṛidhrāddhyāsita-kētana*).[67] He was a wrestler, as it were, in the academy of wise men well versed in all the fine and practical arts (*sakala-kalā-viśārada-sat-sabhā-malla*).[68] The chief's last epithet seems to be *Śrī-Raṇamahāvikrama*. It is strikingly significant that this list of epithets, though a fairly long one, does not endow the chief under question with any title like *Mahārāja* or *Rājan* showing his regal status.

The grant portion which is very much defaced contains reference to the innumerable temples (*bahūni bahu-dēvat-āyatanāni*) probably based on firm footing (line 36). Mention is also made of a village with all immunities (line 37) evidently gifted in favour of the god Paramēśvara (*i.e.*, Śiva) with Pārvatī perhaps bearing the name Achalēśvara who is described in the words in the Nominative (lines 38, 47, 61) and whose temple had probably silver vessels, bells etc. (lines 43-44). The description of the same god, *i.e.*, Achalēśvara is continued in the Genitive cases.[69] He is also called Kapōtēśvara and is stated to be very famous (lines 66-67) and to be adorning a temple (*bhavana*) that was probably named as *Abhihita*[70] and had been built by a person called Kapōta, stated to be a *kapōta-vṛitti* (*i.e.*, a *vānaprastha*, or one leading an ascetic life)[71] and to be residing in the place (*idaṁ sthānaṁ*, line 65) which may be in all likelihood, the same as the place Chēzerla itself. There are also references to a gift which was made (*pratipāditaḥ*) obviously in favour of the said god and to something (*i.e.*, earlier gifts) that had disappeared due to some other reasons not specified. (*kāraṇāntarair=astamita*, lines 67-69).

From the third part we learn that the *Mahārāja* Mahēndravikrama perhaps also called Mahēndrapōtēśvara (line 70) had the title *Avanibhājana*. He is described perhaps as a worshipper of god Hara (*i.e.*, Śiva). He was a meditator on the feet of Bappabhaṭṭāraka,[72] and was a member of the family of those who belonged to the Bhāradvāja *gōtra*, had performed probably *Aśvamēdha* and were obeyed by their feudatories. His capital (name lost) was watered by the river Vēgavatī, *i.e.*, the river that passes by Kāñchīpuram.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

K.V.S. Aiyer seems to be perfectly right in identifying Pṛithivīyuvarāja of the inscription with Pṛithivīduvarāja of the Kopparam plates, which we shall examine next.[73] This identification is propped up by the fact that both the records belong to the same age and to the same area. Further more, in both the records he is not endowed with any regal title and in both he is pictured to have done something for the sake of the lineage of his son. By the Chezerla inscription he made a donation for the welfare of his son's lineage while in the Kopparam plates he claims to have secured a kingdom for the same lineage. All these favour the above identification. The difference between the spellings of Pṛithivīyuvarāja and Pṛithivīduvarāja in the respective records may not matter much. For, one and the same person is called as Brahmayuvarāja and also as Brahmaduvarāja in one and the same Kasakkudi plates of Nandivarman Pallavamalla.[74] Similarly the Eastern Chālukya Maṅgiyuvarāja is also referred to sometimes as Maṅgiduvarāja in epigraphs.[75] The Chezerla inscription says that Pṛithivīyuvarāja's mother was a princess of the Ānanda family. But from the extant portion of the record nothing is known about the family to which his father belonged. The theory of his Rāshṭrakūṭa affinity is based on flimsy grounds.[76] Again, as Dr. Fleet said, the earliest traces of the Rāshṭrakūṭas come from the Central India and from the part of the former Bombay Presidency,[77] and nothing from the Eastern Deccan.

Because of its palaeography and contents, the Chezerla inscription and the hero Pṛithivīyuvarāja mentioned therein are to be assigned to the first quarter of the seventh century. Hence the hero's maternal grandfather Kandara may be assigned to the second half of the previous century. Evidently he was a descendant of the Ānanda kings Kandara, Attivarman and Damōdaravarman known from the Ānanda records. Even those who take[78] him to be a predecessor of Attivarman of the Gorantla plates, are not unmindful of the palaeographical difficulty that their theory suffers from.[79] The significance of his title *Trikūṭa-parvatapati* has already been discussed.[80] On the authority of the *Mattavilāsa-prahasana*, the king Mahēndravikrama-mahāraja of the inscription is to be identified with the author of that play, *viz.*, the Pallava king Mahēndravarman I, the son of Siṁhavishṇu.[81] This identification draws much strength from the fact that the king is said to be a member of the family of those who had performed the *Aśvamēdha* and belonged to the Bhāradvāja *gōtra*. There can possibly be any doubt that this is the well-known description of the Pallava family only. Moreover in that family Mahēndravarman I was the only king known to bear the title *Avanibhājana* found in the inscription. It may be also noted that this *biruda* as well as the name Mahēndravikrama are met with together in the same king's Tiruchirāpaḷḷi cave.[82]

Of the geographical units mentioned in the record, the Kōlissaras, where Pṛithivīyuvarāja was camping, is described to be the foremost among the bodies of water (*nīra-kētu*), and to be a famous one. We are also told that at the time of the issue of the epigraph, the above *saras* or lake, was a camping place,[83a] evidently of Pṛithivīyuvarāja, with his seven[83] crores of war-roops that had come from Dhānyakaṭa and were impassable because of the enemy's army of elephants they had destroyed. There is no famous lake in the Coastal Andhra other than the Kolēru lake, that can answer to such a description. As we have already seen, the bank of the Kolēru lake was also a military camp of Pulakēśi II and served as a battle field where that Chālukya

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

used his army of elephants. In still earlier times it had also served probably as a battle field when Samudragupta invaded the area.[84] The place continued to be battle field more than once even in subsequent ages too.[85] Therefore it is very probable that the Kōlissaras where Pṛithivīyuvarāja was camping with his seven crores of troops and had destroyed the enemy's army of elephants was identical with the Kolēru lake. This lake is hardly 30 to 40 miles from Dhānyakaṭa of Pṛithivīyuvarāja. As the word *ēṟu* is a synonym of the Sanskrit *saras*, 'lake', there may not be any insurmountable phonetical difficulty in the Kōlissaras=Kolēru lake equation.

Dhānyakaṭa, whose huge army Pṛithivīyuvarāja was commanding at the Kōlissaras is the same as Dhañakaḍa etc., of the Prākṛit records of the earlier age, and it has been identified with the modern Dharaṇikōṭa near Amarāvatī on the southern bank of the Kṛishṇā.[86] From the Mayidavolu plates of the Pallava Śivaskandavarman[87] (c. 350 A.D.) it is known that that place was a provincial capital of the Pallavas. It is likely that even during the time of the Pallava Mahēndravarman, the place enjoyed the same status. Yuan Chwang who resided several months in Amarāvatī in 639 A.D.,[88] speaks of the country under the name *Tē-na-ka-che-ka*,[89] or *To-na-kie-tse-kia* (*Dhānyakaṭaka*).[90] It probably corresponds to the region with its capital at Dhānyakaṭaka. It is significant that in the Chezerla inscription an army is said to have come from this place.[91] The lexicons recognise the word *kaṭaka* in the sense of 'army', 'royal headquarters' etc. Therefore it is likely that Dhānyakaṭaka was not only the provincial headquarters but also the headquarters of a regiment of the army of the monarch, *i.e.*, Mahēndravarman, kept under his chief Pṛithivīyuvarāja, obviously to guard the northern frontier of the Pallava empire. The city of Kandarapura must have been a capital of the Ānanda rulers wherefrom the earlier Ānanda king Dāmōdaravarman issued his Mattepad plates.[92] It has been located in the vicinity of the modern Chēzerla.[93] Some have proposed to identify it with the modern village Kantēru (Guntur District).[94] Of the two *janapadas* or provinces over which Kandara was ruling, one may have been the region around Kandarapura itself.[95] The other province was perhaps the region around Dhānayakaṭa referred to by Yuan Chwang as the country of Dhānyakaṭaka.[96] The other geographical units, *viz.*, the mountain Trikūṭaparvata, and the rivers Sitētara-Beṇṇā and Vēgavatī all mentioned in the record have been already identified.

Though the date portion of the record is unfortunately lost, there cannot be any doubt that it belongs to the reign of the Pallava Mahēndravarman I usually assigned to c. 600-630 A.D.[97] Again as that king is described here as a worshipper of Śiva, the record is to be assigned not to the early part of his reign, but to a period after his conversion from Jainism to the Śaivism under the influence of the saint Appar.[98] But the point that clinches the date of the record is the reference to the Kōlissaras or Kolēru as a battle-field. As we shall see subsequently, this battle was fought against Pulakēśi II. We have already learnt from the Māruṭūra grant that the Chālukyan conqueror was camping on the banks of the Kolēru in May, 616 A.D. Again the battle on the banks of the Kolēru seems to have been fought by Pulakēśi with Pṛithivīyuvarāja.[99] At the same time the Chezerla record issued by the latter from the same Kolēru seems to quote some month of the autumnal season (August-October) as the date of the record.[100] Therefore it is probable that the Chezerla record belongs to some date, a few months after the date of the Māruṭūra grant.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

(2) *The Kopparam Plates* : This well known record comes from the village Koppāram (Narasaraopet Taluk, Guntur District). It belongs to the reign of Pulakēśi II, and is dated Thursday, Kārttika Mahānavamī (*i.e.*, śu. 9)[101] in his 21st regnal year. These details are to be equated with the 8th October, 631 A.D. The charter records an order issued by Pṛithivīduvarāja[102] when Vallabha, *i.e.*, Pulakēśi II, was present in person. By that order (*ājñapti*) the chief granted some village in the Karmarāshṭra (Guṇṭūr-Nellore region) to a certain Brāhmaṇa. Pṛithivīduvarāja is described to have won victories over his enemies and to have secured a kingdom in the lineage of his son. The concerned portion of the record reads :

> *Pulakēśi-Pṛithivīvallabha-mahārājō yathārhaṁ sammānayati/Viditam=astu Vallabhē samaksh-āvasthitē vidhivat=sampradattā mathā Kalikulānām=anēka-saṅgrāma-sāhasa-dakshēṇa nikṛishṭa-maṇḍalāgra-saṇāthēna sva-bāhunā vipaksha-maṇḍalaṁ nirjitya sva-sutānvayē pratishthāpita—rājyasya Pṛithivīduvarājasy=ājñaptiḥ*[103] (lines 7-10).

The date portion of the record runs :

> *Pravardhamāna-vijaya-rājya-saṁvatsarē ēkaviṁśē Karttikamāsē Mahānavamyām Bṛihaspativārē praśastē muhūrttē=syā dattēr=ājñaptiḥ* (lines 13-14).

Regarding the identification of Pṛithivīduvarāja of the record there is some difference of opinion. Sri Lakshman Rao identified[104] him with *Satyāśraya* Dhruvarāja Indravarman of the Goa plates of Śaka 532[105] or 610 A.D. But the details of the date of the present Kopparam record corresponded actually to the 8th October 631 A.D., and without some special justification one perhaps should not assume that the said Indravarman who, as known from the said Goa plates, had already completed 21 years of service by 610 A.D., continued to be in service as late as 631 A.D. and was posted in the Eastern Deccan far away from his home. On the other hand Dr. Hultzsch believed that the expression *Pṛithivīduvarāja, i.e.*, °*yuvarāja*, is a title meaning "the heir-apparent of the earth" in contrast to the title *Pṛithivīvallabha* of Pulakēśi II, meaning "the husband of the earth". So he identified him with Kubja Vishṇuvardhana,[106] the younger brother of Pulakēśi II. For, he figures as a *yuvarāja* in the Satara plates dated in the eighth year of that emperor. Again as the Kopparam charter is a Chālukya record, one may be tempted to take the *yuvarāja* mentioned therein to be a Chālukyan prince. Hence this view has gained support of scholars in general.[107]

But, one may be permitted to point out this. All including those who have built up the above theory of Pṛithivīyuvarāja=Vishṇuvardhana identification, do take the expression like *Brahmaduvarāja* or °*yuvarāja* [of the Kasakkudi plates][108] *Akalaṅkattuvarāyar* (*i.e.*, °*yuvarāja*) of the Ambur (North Arcot District) inscription of Nṛipatuṅga][109] and *Maṅgiyuvarāja* [of the Eastern Chālukyan records] as personal names only. Nobody has gone to the extent of treating them as titles in the sense of heir-apparents of Brahman, of Akalaṅka and of Maṅgi respectively. Similarly, though *Pṛithivīvallabha* is a title and means 'the husband of the earth', the expressions like *Pṛithivīrāja*,[110] *Pṛithivīmahārāja*,[111] *Pṛithivīpati*,[112] etc., are always treated as personal names of the respective kings. Therefore like the last mentioned names, Pṛithivīduvarāja of the Kopparam charter may also have to be taken as a personal name rather than as a title. Besides, the above argument, based

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

on the contrast between *Pṛithivīyuvarāja* and *Pṛithivīvallabha*, carries, in fact little or no weight at all. For, even when he was a *yuvarāja*, Kubja Vishṇuvardhana had assumed the *biruda Pṛithivīvallabha* "lord (or husband) of the earth" and the same Satara plates of 616 A.D. refer to him as *Śri-Pṛithivīvallabha* Vishṇuvarddhana *Yuvarāja Vishamasidhi*,[113] while it introduces Pulakēśi simply by the title *Mahārāja*. Therefore Pṛithivīduvarāja of the Kopparam plates may better be identified with his namesake of the Chezerla inscription. While editing the Kopparam plates, Dr. Hultzsch was not aware of the occurrence of the name Pṛithivīyuvarāja in the Chezerla record. Therefore to follow his path even to-day[114] is to ignore the later discovery and research.

Even accepting that this Pṛithivīduvarāja of the Kopparam plates was Vishṇuvardhana I, one is at a loss to understand why he should boast himself of having secured the kingdom in the lineage of his son by conquering his enemies. Does it not betray that Pṛithivīduvarāja had already made his son the king of the territory he had conquered, himself remaining without any claim to the royal position ? Such a boast would indeed pass strange in the context of Vishṇuvardhana's position in 631 A.D. For, it is almost certain that by that time he had himself become a king.[115] Even if he was a mere heir-apparent at that time, there cannot be any doubt that he had secured the kingdom for himself and his own lineage. On the other hand, if it is presumed that he had not secured the kingdom for himself and his own lineage by that date, then he could not have secured it for his son's lineage also. Therefore in either way it would be incongruous with his status to boast himself of securing the kingdom in the lineage of his son, excluding himself.

On the contrary the above description in the Kopparam record, if applied to Pṛithivīyuvarāja of the Chezerla record, would have its purpose and meaning. For, as we have already seen, that chief had no claim to royalty. The fact that he granted something for the welfare of the lineage of his son reveals that his son was already in power at least in a *de jure*, if not in a *de facto*, capacity. Thus, the circumstances indicated by both the Chezerla and Kopparam records go to suggest that Pṛithivīyuvarāja continued to be a *yuvarāja* or crown-prince even during the reign of his son, probably because the crown directly went from somebody else to his son. Such a succession was not unknown in the area under question. For, in a later period when the Eastern Chālukya king Rājarāja I died and the kingdom came to his step-brother Vijayāditya VII, the latter did not choose to be the king. Rather he gave the kingdom to his son Śaktivarman II out of paternal affection[116] in October, 1061 A.D.[117]

The above detailed study of the contents of these two records and the identification of persons and places mentioned therein may help us to understand the history of the period under question. The fact that the Chezerla inscription of Pṛithivīyuvarāja is dated in the regnal year of Mahēndravarman shows that the former was a feudatory of that Pallava monarch. We have seen earlier how the Pallava reduced the Ānandas to vassalage and how Mādhavavarman II vanquished the Pallava and captured the Ānanda territory and appointed the princes of his own family as governors, and how subsequently the Vishṇukuṇḍis were forced to abandon their hold over the territory.[118] The Ānanda ruler Kandara of the Chezerla inscription or his immediate predecessor must have re-established his power in the area by driving out the Vishṇu-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

kuṇḍi ruler, understandably with the help of his Pallava overlord. The vanquisher appropriated for himself with a modification the title *Trikūṭa-Malayādhipati*[119] of the vanquished. Therefore Kandara and his successors must have remained loyal feudatories of the Pallava.

As we have already seen, the 28th verse of the Aihole *praśasti* tells us that in the battle at the Kolēru, Pulakēśi II employed elephants, evidently of his own, and killed many army men. This battle was fought in 616 A.D. as has been pointed out earlier. On the other hand, in the Chezerla record of almost the same period, Pṛithivīyuvarāja, a feudatory of Mahēndravarman, claims to be camping with a huge army under him and to have killed many elephants of the enemy in the Kōlissaras *i.e.*, Kolēru. Moreover, immediately after describing the battle of Kolēru (verse 28), the Aihole *praśasti* informs us (verse 29) this. A certain Pallava king, with his[120] six-fold forces[121] *viz.*, the hereditary troops and the rest, suppressed the rise of the power, or made ineffective the eminence of the army of Pulakēśi.[122] And Pulakēśi compelled that Pallava to take shelter behind the ramparts of his capital Kāñchī. The verse under consideration reads :

Uddhūt-āmala-chāmara-dhvaja-śata-chchhatr-āndhakārair=balaiḥ
śaury-ōtsāha-ras-ōddhat-āri-mathanair=maul-ādibhiḥ shaḍ-vidhaiḥ ।
ākrānt-ātma-bal-ōnnatiṁ bala-rajas-sañchhanna-Kāñchīpura-
prākār-āntarita-pratāpam=akarōd=yaḥ Pallavānām patim ॥

It has been agreed in general that the Pallava enemy of Pulakēśi II, referred to in the above verse, was Mahēndravarman I[123] who, as we saw, was no other than the king Mahēndravikrama of the Chezerla record. These cumulative evidences strongly suggest that the person who gave a tough fight to Pulakēśi on the bank of the Kolēru was Pṛithivīyuvarāja and that the latter fought with a huge army on the side, or on behalf of, his overlord, Pallava Mahēndravarman I. True, it may be a mere "speculation,"[124] if the expression *ākrant-ātma-bal-ōnnatiṁ Pallavānām patim* of the above verse is taken to be an indication "that the Pallava had attempted to nip in the bud the rise of the Chālukyas", as early as the time of Kīrttivarman I.[125] But it seems to be a fact that in the above verse of the *praśasti* there is a reference to the conflict of the two powers, *viz.*, the Chālukya and Pallava, even before the seige of Kāñchī by Pulakēśi, but soon after Pulakēśi's capture of Pishṭapura. The Māruṭūra grant and the Chezerla and Aihole records give us to understand that the venue of the above confrontation was the bank of the Kolēru. The Chezerla record itself seems to suggest that Mahēndravarman was probably present at Kōlissaras area or at Chezerla (*ētad-avasthāna*) at the time of the issue of the record (*idānīm*) and had concluded some treaty or agreement for help (*kṛit-ābhi sandhi-sahāyē*), obviously, to Pṛithivīyuvarāja.

With the material now available it is difficult to be sure about the circumstances that led to the above Pallava-Chālukya conflict. However, one may suggest this. As we have seen earlier, the house of the Vishṇukuṇḍis suddenly disappeared about 612 A.D., resulting in an utter confusion and chaos in the region. The situation must have been so tempting as to attract the attention of Mahēndravarman as it did that of Pulakēśi II. The former's dominions included territories just on the other side of the Kṛishṇā as the Chezerla inscription indicates.[126] We have already referred to the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

probability of Mahēndravarman being a Vishṇukuṇḍi on his mother's side.[127] Therefore, it was quite natural that Mahēndravarman aimed at acquiring for himself the kingdom of the Vishṇukuṇḍis just as Pulakēśi II did. He simply crossed the Kṛishṇā and marched at least as far as the Kolēru, which was after all not far removed from his provincial capital Dhānyakaṭa. Here he had before him the tempting example of the Pallava Siṁhavarman of the Māṅgaḷūru grant, who too, only about half a century earlier, crossed the Kṛishṇā, and occupied the Vēṅgīrāshṭra almost upto the same lake.[128] There on the bank of the lake, the army of the Pallava Mahēndravarman met the army of the Chālukya marching from the north. Thus the struggle between the Pallava and Chālukya rulers must have ensued from their common aim to capture Vēṅgī, the erstwhile kingdom of the Vishṇukuṇḍis.

The Aihole *praśasti* gives us to understand that Pulakēśi had inflicted heavy damages to his enemy's army in the battle of Kolēru. But it does not give us an impression that the monarch had won the battle easily. We saw earlier that he lost there his beloved general Ālukarāja.[129] At the same time Pṛithivīyuvarāja claims to have crushed the army of elephants of the enemy, and to be bent upon vanquishing one who is referred to as *atibala* (the most powerful) a word which probably refers to Pulakēśi II himself. These perhaps betray that Pulakēśi was not successful in that battle, to begin with atleast. Yet, the course of subsequent events show that soon afterwards the stars of the Chālukya started going up. Pulakēśi II must have won the war and annexed the Vēṅgī area finally. Therefore in this sense Dr. Fleet may be right in saying that the Vēṅgī country was taken away by the Chālukya from the Pallavas.[130] Pulakēśi did not stop at that. As a retaliatory measure he marched and penetrated farther south well into the heart of the Pallava territory. And the Aihole *praśasti* tells us that he besieged Kāñchī itself, the capital of the Pallavas.

One cannot be quite sure whether Pulakēśi did all these immediately following the date of the Māruṭūra grant, or only after sometime. An investigation of this question is beyond the scope of the present study. Yet this much is certain : It is clear from the Kopparam plates that Pulakēśi II was present in person in the Guṇṭūr region in 631 A.D. His presence there at that time must have been most probably only in connection with the conquest of the area. But at the same time the Māruṭūra grant informs us that he was camping near the Kolēru in 616 A.D. As it is very unlikely that he continued to stay in the east for sixteen long years (*i.e.*, from 616 to 631 A.D.), it is logical to conclude that after the battle of Kolēru, Pulakēśi probably abandoned, for the time being, the idea of continuing further conquest in the East Coast and returned home entrusting, in 616 A.D. itself as we have seen already, to his brother Vishṇuvardhana the task of consolidating the newly and partly conquered territories in the east.[131] This change of policy was obviously due to the remarkable shrewdness of Pulakēśi in realising the hard realities. The Pallava king Mahēndravarman, the lord of the trans-Kṛishṇā region was really a powerful monarch and he had under him in the area a capable feudatory Pṛithivīyuvarāja in command of a formidable army.

By 630 A.D., circumstances changed in favour of Pulakēśi. About that time Mahēndravarman I was no more. As indicated by the Kopparam plates, Mahēndravarman's powerful vassal Pṛithivīyuvarāja changed his allegiance from the Pallava to

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

the Chālukyan side. The reason for this change-over is not known. It is after all an ordinary phenomenon always in politics that yesterday's enemies turn to be today's friends and *vice versa*.[132] Pulakēśi was equally shrewd enough not to miss that opportune time. He seems to have revisited the East Coast to complete the scheme of conquest left earlier unfinished. Now in his war-activities in the area he seems to have received considerable help from Pṛithivīyuvarāja. In recognition of the latter's service, the emperor probably confirmed the rulership of the Ānanda territory on Pṛithivīyuvarāja's son and the latter's descendants, understandably as the vassals under the Chālukya sovereign, just as they had been under their earlier overlords of the Pallava dynasty. Thus it is very likely that the Chālukyan conquest of Vēṅgī preceded that of the Guṇṭūr region at least by more than a decade.[133]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. See below Ch. X.
2. In the expression *Kalūr[ā*]d=dēvatvam=upagataḥ*, the Ablative is according to the rule *Lyab-lōpē karmaṇy=adhikaraṇē cha* (*Vārttika* under the *Siddhāntakaumudī*, 594) and may mean *Kalūrē saṁyudhya dēvatvam=upagataḥ* 'one who has become god by fighting at Kalūra'. There are umpteen passages in literature telling us that the heroes, who die fighting, turn to be gods. See *e.g. Vīra. Rāja.*, pp. 405 ff. So, the passage cannot, mean "(one) who took up the overlord of Kalūra" as some have taken (APGAS, No. 6, pp. 12, 34). Besides, Pulakēśi would not have made the gift for the *akshayya-phala* for such a conqueror.
3. See below.
4. The theory according to which the issuer of the Māruṭūra grant was indentical with Pulakēśi's son Vikramāditya I (K.V. Ramesh, *Hist. of S. Karnataka*, p.40) ignores altogether the points raised by the record (see below) and seems to go counter to the already well established facts of the history of the Western and the Eastern Chālukyas.
5. The expression *Kadamba(mbā)-nāmadhēyā* may not indicate that the queen was of the Kadamba clan as has been believed by some (APGAS, No. 6, p. 33). Rather she seems to be an Āḷupa princess. See below.
6. This name is spelt as both *Āluka* (Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscr.) and *Āḷupa* (Aihole *praśasti*).
7. AK, I, p. 82.
8. See *e.g.* the *Mudrārākshasa*, III, verse 3, where *guru* is used in the sense of 'father'.
9. It reminds us of the Mallam (Nellore District) record of the 15th year of the Pallava Nandivarman II Pallavamalla (acc. c. 730 A.D.) *i.e.*, c. 744-45 A.D. (CA, p. 283) recording a gift of gold to a Subrahmaṇya temple of the place made by certain persons as ordered by the *Chalukki araśar* (*i.e.*, the Chālukya Vikramāditya II) at the instance of an Āḷuva (Āḷupa) king. This Āḷuva king of the Mallam epigraph must have followed the example of his distant predecessor Āḷuka-mahārāja of the Māruṭūra grant and took part in the Chālukyan campaign of the Pallava country.
10. APGAS, No. 6, p. 16 ; KESIH., pp. 65-66 ; JMU, XXXVIII, pp. 259-60.
11. See below.
12. EI, XXXI, pp. 132 ff.
13. APGAS, No. 6, p. 16.
14. Therefore the contention that Mangalore attained the status of the Āḷupa capital only in later days (AK, pp. 173, 219) may require reconsideration.
15. For a detailed discussion by the writer on the problems connected with this equivalent see *Studies in Indian History and Culture* (Prof. P.B. Desai's Felicitation Volume, Dharwar, 1971) pp. 64 ff.
16. EI, VI, p. 3.
17. Ibid., p. 6, verses 27-28.
18. See Appendix, VI.
19. IA, XX, p. 12.
20. EHD, p. 472.
21. JOR, IX, pp. 17 ff.
22. See above Ch. VI, sect. *ii*.
23. To assign Vishṇuvardhana's reign to a period of 615-33 A.D. and at the same time the Chālukyan conquest of Vēṅgī to 631 A.D. may amount to assign only three years to Vishṇuvardhana's rule over that country (CA 250-52), taking no cognizance of the Eastern Chālukyan records which are unanimous in declaring that the said king actually ruled over Vēṅgī for eighteen years. See *e.g.*, SII, I, p. 47.
24. CA, pp. 232-33.
25. Above Ch. V, sect. iii.
26. EHD, p. 209. See also BG, p. 349.
27. BG, p. 194.
28. Ibid., p. 350, n. 2 ; p. 386, n. 1. See also CA, p. 235.
29. Altekar, *Rāshṭrakūṭas and Their Times*, pp. 8-10 ; EHD, p. 250.
30. EI, XI, pp. 276 ff.
31. EI, XXVIII, pp. 3-4.
32. CA, p. 202 f.
33. See ibid., for the theory that Gōvindarāja's father Durgarāja flourished about the middle of the 7th century and was probably

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

appointed as a *rāshṭrakūṭa* or provincial governor by Pulakēśi II.

34. EHD, p. 212. Cf. BG, p. 350, n; p. 386 n.
35. BG, pp. 385-86
36. Above Ch. IV, sect. ii.
37. Above Ch. V, sect. iii. Ignoring the chronological and other difficulties attempts have been made to identify this Gōvinda who invaded the Chālukyan territory as stated in the Aihole *praśasti* (*i.e.*, in c. 608 A.D.) with his namesake, who was the grandfather of the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Nanna of Central India (EI, XXVIII, p. 3 ; XXIX, p. 112) for whom we have dates in A.D. 623, 709, and 731-32 (CA, p. 202).
38. Above Ch. VI, sect. ii.
39. BG, p. 351.
40. See EHD, p. 215.
41. See above Ch. VI, sect. ii ; Ch. VII, sect. iii.
42. For these different views see respectively AHD, p. 113 ; SEHI, p. 441 ; QJMS, XXX, pp. 328-29 : EHD, p. 216; MDG, *Godavari*, I, p. 19; CA, pp. 211, 239, 250.
43. IA, XX, p. 94 f.; BG, p. 352.
44. See above Ch. VI, sect. i.
45. IA, XX, p. 94.
46. See above Ch. VI, sect. ii.
47. See No. XVI, lines 19-20 and n.
48. For, in the ARE for the year 1900, there is no inscr. bearing No. 155 A in the list of inscriptions copied in 1899, as we find in SII, VI. See below.
49. SII, VI, Nos. 594 and 595, marked respectively as AR. No. 155 and No. 155A of 1899.
50. Ibid. Preface.
51. TL, pp. 52-53. An examination of the record *in situ* may show anyone that the observations of K.V.S. Aiyer are correct. Yet the treatment of texts in SII, VI under two different general numbers had led to much speculations, as *e.g.* at JAHRS, XI, pp. 46-47; EHAC, p. 186.
52. SII, VI, Preface.
53. See No. XVIII, n. 13.
54. See EI, VI, plate facing p. 6.
55. See SII, II, plate facing page 340 ; EI, X, plate facing p. 6.
56. EI, X, p. 2.
57. TL, p. 53; HSAD, II, p. 21. The view that the characters of the record belongs to the 3rd century (ARE, 1920, p. 95) is untenable and is not accepted by scholars. See TL,p. 53; EHAC, p. 187, n. 10 ; CA, p. 203, n. 1.
58. This record, though often referred to by scholars, has not been critically edited and its contents have not been fully discussed so far. This has led to some serious misgivings as in JAHRS, XI, pp. 43 ff ; SS, pp. 396-97; HSI, p. 107 ; etc. As the record is very important for the study of the history of the period, it is dealt with here in detail.
59. Lines 1-33.
60. Lines 33-69.
61. Lines 69-89.
62. Lines 90-93.
63. Lines 5-8. Similar descriptions are often met with in literature (see *Kāda.*, pp. 11, 112 ff). So it may not be correct to interpret the epithet *samavagāḍha* etc. in the sense "defeating Beṇṇānātha, Kandara captured the Andhrasundarīs" (BRA & AH, p. 109). Nor is there any reference in the epithet to Kandaras's causing the widowhood of many Andhra women (APGAS, No. 10, p. 14 ; JMU, XXXVIII, p. 215).
64. K.V.S. Aiyer, (TL, p. 52 f ; HSAD, II, p. 20 f.) was also of the same view. For the untenable interpretation of *Pṛithivīyuvarājaḥ* as the sixth case of *Pṛithivīyuvarāṭ* see EHAC, p. 188 ; CA, p. 203.
65. Line 22. This epithet may not indicate that the chief was of a Rāshṭrakūṭa stock (TL, p. 52 ; HSAD, II, p. 20 f.). For, the Rāshṭrakūṭas claimed only *Garuḍalāñchhana* (EI, VII, p. 227 ; see also *Dr. Mirashi Felicitation Volume*, plate facing p. 390), and nowhere their seal is known to bear the representation of Vishṇu mounted on Garuḍa.
66. The expression *janapad-ādhipati* of the epithet has been taken by some writers as an indication that the chief was a Rāshṭrakūṭa. (See TL, p. 52; HSAD II, p. 20). But one should not forget that the chief was the lord not of the *janapada* alone, but of the *pallis* also. Again, as we have already seen, his maternal grandfather Kandara, who was decidedly a member of the Ānanda family is said to be the lord of two *janapadas*.
67. Line 24. This epithet also has been taken to prove the Rāshṭrakūṭa origin of the chief (TL, p. 52 f ; HSAD, II, p. 20). But there is nothing to show that the Rāshṭrakūṭas themselves had the *gridhra-kētana*.
68. Line 29. This epithet of Pṛithivīyuvarāja indicates that the chief actually took a leading part in the learned assemblies. Such descriptions of the kings are well known in literature (See *Kāda.* pp. 12-14). For a parellel

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

in epigraphs cf. also *Sarvēshu darśanēshu + ++ n-aiv-āsti prativādī vādimaṇḍala-dvirada-kēsariṇaḥ* a description of Vīra Ballāḷa II (EI, VI, p. 95, verse 28). Therefore one may not be justified in disconnecting the expression *satsabhāmalla* from the rest of the compound (EHAC, p. 188) and in treating it as a personal as name of the chief. Such a treatment as well as a study of the record upto this epithet alone, has led to a misgiving that the record belongs to a chief called Satsabhāmalla (JAHRS, XI, pp. 46 ff.; SS, pp. 396-97,; CA, p. 203).

69. For the description of one and the same person in different cases of *yad*, see *Kāda.* pp. 9 ff ; etc. The Kapōtēśvara temple is situated very near a hill (*achala*) in Chezerla. Hence the name Achalēśvara of the god may signify a connection of the same with the hill. Or, as *Achala* is a name of Śiva (see SED, s.v.) the word *Achalā* may be, like *Śivā*, a name of Pārvatī. So the name Achalēśvara may denote Īśvara with Achalā and may be in tune with the mention of Pārvatī-Paramēśvara in the record.
70. See notes under No. XVIII, line 66.
71. *Kapōta* occurs in the MB, also as a name of the god Śiva. See Sorensen, *Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata and Concordance*, s.v. *kapōta*. The term *Kapōta-vṛitti*, denoting life of one who has very little for maintenance is prescribed for the *vānaprastha*. See the *Vāchaspatyam* (Dict.), s.v. Cf. also *Stuvan vṛittiṁ cha kāpōtīm* etc. of the *Bhāga.* (IX, 18, verse 25). Śrīdhara's commentary thereunder explains *kāpōtī-vṛitti.* as *uñchha-vṛitti.*
72. The expression Bappa in similar context is usually taken to mean 'father'. See EI, IV, 145 ; XXX, p. 2 ; XXXI, p. 3 ; EHAC, p. 169 n.
73. TL, p. 53 ; HSAD, II, p. 20.
74. SII, II, p. 351, text lines 103 and 106.
75. EI, XXVII, p. 226 ; ECV, p. 69.
76. See above n. 65-67.
77. BG, p. 384. On the ground that the name Kandara may be a variant of Kṛishṇa, a famous name in the Rāshṭrakūṭa dynasty, the Gorantla (Guntur District) plates of Attivarman of the family of Kandara were once believed to be the earlier of the Rāshṭrakūṭa records (ibid. p. 334). But now all are quite sure that Kandara of the said record was a member of the Ānanda family only.
78. JAHRS, XI, pp. 44 ff; CA, p. 203.
79. CA, p. 203, n.
80. Above Ch. VI, sect. ii; Appendix V. The contention that any three-peaked hill might have been called Trikūṭaparvata (EHAC, pp. 188-89) ignores the fact that no other king of the dynasty and of the area had assumed that or similar title.
81. *Matta.* p. 41
82. See CTP, p. 79.

82a. This is one of the rare instances of early stone inscriptions containing reference to the camp place of the king issuing orders of grant, which is a usual feature of the copper plate charters. For parallel instances see the Nasik cave inscription of Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi, dated in year 18 (EI, VIII, pp. 77 ff) containing order of the king issued from his victorious military camp located in an unnamed place ; and the undated Mukhalingam pillar inscription of the Gaṅga king Anantavarman Chōḍagaṅga that commences with a reference to Kaliṅganagara as a place of the royal seat (SII, V, No. 1010). There are many Tamil inscriptions of the Chōḷas and the Pāṇḍyas specifying the respective places of residences of the monarchs issuing orders. See e.g. SII, IV, pp. 109, 167 ; V, pp. 114, 117 ; etc.

83. It is difficult to ascertain the significance of the number 'seven'. Maybe, it is "used to express an indefinite plurality" (SED, s.v.). Here in the present expression *svaśakti* etc. the compound is Bahuvrīhi and is to be dissolved as *sva + +saṁkaṭāḥ Dhānyakaṭasya raṇa-sapta-kōṭayaḥ yasmin tasmāt.* This epithet may not credit Kandara or Pṛithivīyuvarāja with victory in some battle at Dhānyakaṭa (Cf. JAHRS, XI, p. 44 ; SS, p. 397; CA, p. 203). Kauṭilya speaks of the corporations of warriors (*kshatriya-śrēṇī*) known by the names of the countries like Kambhōja, Surāshṭra, Kukura, Kuru etc. (*Artha.* p. 378). Similarly it is likely *Dhānyakaṭa* may denote a similar corporation of warriors of the country Dhānyakaṭa. See below. 90-91. The interpretation of *sapta-kōṭi* as "a war-implement with seven edges" (JAHRS, XI, p. 44) hardly suits the context.
84. See EI, VI, p. 3, n. 3.
85. See, ED, p. 539, n. 1.
86. See, EI, VI, p. 85 ; FNSI, p. 100.
87. EI, VI, pp. 84 ff.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

88. Watters' *On Yuan Chwang's Travels*, Vol. II, p. 335.
89. Ibid., pp. 214 ff.
90. This identification by Burgess (ASSI, I, p. 9) etc., has been underlined by Vogel (EI, XX, p. 9) in spite of the objections raised by Watters (op. cit., II, p. 216). M. Williams also recognises Dhānyakaṭaka as a name of a country (SED, s. v.)
91. The special mention of Dhānyakaṭa army may have been due to the chief's wish to honour his troops from the place, who were responsible for his success. For an earlier and similar epigraphical reference regarding an army from the locality Vejayanti see EI, VIII, pp. 71-72.
92. EI, XVII, pp. 327, ff.
93. CA, p. 203.
94. BRA & AH, p. 109, n. 2.
95. CA, p. 203.
96. See above.
97. CA, pp. 259, 283. Some writers assign this king to 580-630 A.D. See CTP, p. 5 ; HSI, p. 150. See above Ch. VI, sect. ii.
98. CA, pp. 259, 430-31.
99. See below.
100. See lines 86-87 and notes thereunder.
101. Like the Āśvina śu. 9, the Kārttika śu. 9 too is known as *Mahānavamī*. See KHD, Vol. V, pt. i, p. 374.
102. The expression *vidhivat=sampradattā + + + Pṛithivīduvarājasy=ājñapatiḥ* is usually rendered as "the execution of [the present grant] was formally bestowed on Pṛithivīyuvarāja" (EI, XVIII, p. 260). But such a passage with similar import is not met with in a similar context anywhere else.
103. The text is as corrected by Dr. Hultzsch. See EI, XVIII, pp. 259, lines 7-10.
104. ABORI, IV, pt. i, pp. 46 ff. This identification has been endorsed by other scholars also. See *e.g.* ED, pp. 344 ff.
105. JBBRAS, X, pp. 365 ff. and plates.
106. EI, XVIII, p. 258.
107. See *e.g.* SS, p. 118; CA, p. 250 ; ECV, p. 46 ff ; EHD, pp. 216, 472.
108. Op. cit. *Brahmaduvarāja* of Course may be a title, but in different sense.
109. EI, IV, p. 180 ff.
110. *I.e.*, a name met with more than once in the genealogical list of the Chāhamāna kings.
111. *I.e.*, a name of the donor of the Tāṇḍivāḍa and Gōlāvalli grants.
112. *I.e.* a name met with in the genealogical list of the Gaṅga kings of Talakāḍ.
113. IA, XIX, pp. 309-10, lines 11-12, 35.
114. Cf. EI, XXXI, p. 130, n. 3.
115. For, in the undated Timmapuram plates (EI, IX, pp. 317 ff.) Vishṇuvardhana I styles himself as *Mahārāja*. Now, apart from the above untenable theory of Pṛithivīduvarāja-Vishṇuvardhana identification, there seems to be practically no valid reason why one should not assign that record to a date anterior to that of the Kopparam plates.
116. Cf. *Gṛihītvā sva-sutē snēhāt rājyaṁ Śrī-Śaktivarmaṇi nyastam* etc. JAHRS, IX, pt. i, p. 31. If one school of thought is followed then there may also be a precedence in the Pallava history (CA. p. 279).
117. See EI, XXXV, pp. 262-64.
118. Ch. IV, sect. ii ; Ch. V, Sect. ii.
119. See Appendix V.
120. The Instrumental *balaiḥ shaḍvidhaiḥ* 'with six-fold forces' (in the first half of the verse) has been usually construed with the verb *akarōt* (almost at the end of the fourth quarter), of which the *kartṛi* or the subject is *yaḥ i.e.*, Pulakēśi (ASWI, III, p. 138; EI, VI, p. 11). Naturally therefore the six-fold forces have been taken to be that of the Chālukya ruler. (Ibid.) However the act of *ākramaṇa* or 'over-powering' of the eminence of Pulakeśi's *bala* needs an Instrumental which must be obviously some *bala*. Therefore, there should be no reason why the above Instrumental should ignore the immediately following *ākrānta* and go with the distant *akarōt* (Cf. *pratham-ātikramaṇē kāraṇ-ābhāvaḥ*). As *Pallavānām=pati* is the *kartṛi* of *ākrānta*, the six-fold forces are to be taken as an army of the Pallava ruler and not of the Chālukya king.
121. For the details of the six-fold forces see *Artha*. pp. 342 ff ; and EI, XXXVII, pp. 169, 172.
122. *Ākrānt-ātma-balōnnati* has been rendered by Kielhorn as "who had opposed the rise of his (*i e.*, Pulakēśi's) power" (EI, VI, p. 11) and by Prof. K.A.N. Sastri as "who had approached him (Pulakēśi) in strength and eminence" (*Journ. of Andhra Hist. and Cult.*, I, p. 170). See also KESIH, p. 79.
123. BG, pp. 324, 350 ; AHD, p. 113 ; CA, p. 238, 259 ; EHD, p. 215 ; etc. According to some, the Pallava rival of Pulakēśi

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

referred to in the above verse was not Mahēndravarman I but his son Narasiṁhavarman I. See *e.g.* IHQ, XXVIII, pp. 60 ff.; KESIH, p. 79.

124. EHD, p. 215, n.
125. SII, XI, Introd. p. ii.
126. On some other grounds Dubreuil had independently come to the same conclusion (See *The Pallavas*, p. 35).
127. Above Ch. VI, sect. i.
128. Ibid.
129. Above sect. i and ii.
130. IA, XX, p. 94.
131. EHD, p. 216.
132. Hence, there is no wonder, if a Bāṇa chief named Raṇavikrama of the Anantapur region, is found changing his allegiance from the Chālukya to the Pallava during this period (EHD, p. 217). For other instances of the feudatories of the Pallavas joining to the Chālukyan side during the period see KESIH, p. 81.
133. ECV, p. 58. See also KESIH, pp. 66 ff.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CHAPTER IX

ADMINISTRATION AND SOCIETY

NOT much material has come to us for studying how the Vishṇukuṇḍis conducted the administration of their kingdom and how the people were living under their rule. Yet with the material available we may try to understand this aspect of their history to the extent possible.

(i) ADMINISTRATION

(1) Administrative Divisions

The Vishṇukuṇḍi records indicate the popularity of the concepts of two *chakravartikshētras*—the smaller one comprising Southern India and the bigger comprising the whole of India.[1] However, it must be noted that in fact the Vishṇukuṇḍi dominions consisted only of that territory extending from the Guntur District in the south to the Srikakulam District in the north, and from the Bay of Bengal in the east to the Bhīmā river in the west. This territory was divided into a number of units known as *rāshṭra*, *dēśa*, *vishaya*, etc., all consisting of number of villages. These divisions were administered either directly by the kings, or through the princes appointed as viceroys, or through the feudatories—all having their headquarters in the cities like, Trivaranagara, Vēlpūru, Tāḷupāka, etc., of the respective divisions.

(2) The King

The form of government was monarchy and the royal succession was on the principle of primogeniture. However, after Mādhavavarman II who died later than his first son Dēvavarman the crown went to the former's second son Vikramēndravarman I and not to Dēvavarman's living son Mādhavavarman III.[2] The Vishṇukuṇḍi dynasty did not claim any divine origin. Yet, it is probable that following the ancient Indian literary tradition the kings of the dynasty, perhaps for the first time in the history of South India, styled themselves as gods personified.[3] A sort of divine right of the kings to govern their people is also emphasised.[4] Naturally, therefore, they must have had the divine right to collect taxes also.[5] Thus, as the supreme heads of the state, *i.e.*, in respect of the administration, army and judiciary, the Vishṇukuṇḍi kings, obviously held enormous powers. However, it must be noted that their powers seem to have been checked and regulated to a very great extent by the injunctions of the *smṛitis* and the *śāstras* which they had studied well. They were afraid of sins and believed that their reputation was entirely depending on the good and just administration of their subjects and on their well being. They took upon themselves the burden of safeguarding the *varṇāśrama-dharma*.[6] The fact that the Vishṇukuṇḍi kings did not attach much importance to the titles like *Mahārāja* etc., and that they assumed titles like *janāśraya*, *satyāśraya* etc.,[7] may also indicate that even though they were supreme Kings they did not always consider themselves supreme.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

(3) Royal Family

Besides kings, other members of the royal house also took part in the administration of the kingdom. We have seen already how the princes of the family took part in wars fought by their elders and how they were appointed as governors for administering different provinces. However, the queens do not usually figure in the Vishṇukuṇḍi records. The only exception is Gōvindavarman's queen Paramamahādēvī who is described as the builder of a Buddhist monastery in Indrapura. After the time of the Ikshvāku queens who figure as donors often in the Nagarjunakonda records, this Paramamahādēvī may be the first queen in the area to figure likewise.[8]

(4) Officers and Administrative Arrangements

No individual minister of the king is referred to in the Vishṇukuṇḍi records. However, a study of the Vishṇukuṇḍi history would show that the kings of the dynasty were engaged almost constantly in wars both defensive and offensive. Therefore, it could not have been possible for them to give personally full attention to the home-front, *i.e.*, the civil administration. Hence, the Vishṇukuṇḍi monarchs must have well understood the value of the advice of the writers like Manu, Kauṭilya, etc., that the car of the king's sovereignty could not move with single wheel alone.[9] That is why they had their own council of ministers, who once evidently following Kauṭilya's sayings,[10] set up the worthy minor prince Vikramēndravarman II on the throne, probably on the unexpected demise of his father Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman.[11] How the administration of the kingdom was actually carried on cannot be ascertained as the Vishṇukuṇḍi records are not illustrative on this point and contain reference to a few officers only. Yet, there can hardly be any doubt that the administration must have been conducted with the help of a good number of officials and village assemblies. The following designations of the officials and the members of the town and village assemblies are mentioned:

Ājñapti and *Āñā*: This designation is generally taken to denote an officer receiving the royal order for issuing charters. In the Vishṇukuṇḍi charters, occasionally a prince or a feudatory acted in this capacity. However, the royal donors themselves were often the *ājñaptis* of their own charters.

Adhikārapurusha:[12] This designation may either denote an officer of the king in general (*ādhikārika* or *adhikārin*) or a magistrate.[13]

Dūta: This term signifies a messenger or an envoy in general. The context, in which this designation occurs in the Vishṇukuṇḍi records,[14] does not seem to indicate that it is used in the sense of an executor of a grant, as found elsewhere.

Kāyastha: This official is mentioned only in the Khanapur plates and it denotes, as has been already stated, 'a scribe' or 'a writer'. This record, along with several others[15] may go against the contention that the *kāyastha* does not figure in inscriptions till the 6th century A.D.[16]

Vallabha:[17] This official is usually taken to be in-charge of the king's cattle or the cavalry.[18]

Sāndhivigrahika: This designation, denoting the minister for peace and war occurs only in a Gaṅga record[19] and not in any of the Vishṇukuṇḍi inscriptions studied by us. This official figures as the writer of that Gaṅga charter. However, as the *smṛitis* enjoin that the *sāndhivigrahika* alone should write the charters under royal

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

orders,[20] and as no writer is mentioned in the Vishṇukuṇḍi charters, it may be presumed that these charters also had been written by the *sāndhivigrahikas* alone following the general practice.

Hastikōśa and Vīrakōśa : As we have already seen, these two designations represent the officers respectively in command of the elephant and infantry forces of the king.[21]

Chāṭa and Bhaṭa : The first designation, though generally mean 'a spy' is found used in a Vishṇukuṇḍi record[22] as a synonym of *chāṭa* denoting 'irregular soldier'.[23] *Bhaṭa* may be a regular soldier, or a constable. The passage *a-chāṭa-bhaṭa-pravēśyaḥ chōra-drōhaka-varjam* found elsewhere[24] indicates that the *chāṭas* and *bhaṭas* were employed to seize and put down the thieves and the *rājadrōhins*.

Rāshṭrakūṭa: This official was perhaps in-charge of the territorial unit called *rāshṭra*. It is also at times taken diversely to denote a member of the administrative council of a *rāshṭra*[25] or the headman of a village.[26]

Vishayamahattara:[27] As lexicons recognise *janapada, dēśa, vishaya* etc., as synonyms[28] and as *mahattara* means 'an elder' or 'a head-man', the present designation may be the same as Daṇḍin's *janapada-mahattara* and may denote 'a headman and a member of the administrative or advisory council of a country.'[29]

Grāmavṛiddha:[30] This term meaning literally 'an elder of a village' may denote *grāma-mahattara* "the village headman or a member of the village council."[31]

In spite of the above list of officers and members of the councils of the village and the country, we get actually no information how the Vishṇukuṇḍi administration was working. But, on the whole one may presume that the Vishṇukuṇḍi secretariat might have been vigilant and efficient. This suggestion may gain some support from their epigraphs indicating that the edicts had been seen and checked by the concerned officials before they were issued;[32] that the delay between the issue of the royal orders and the issue of the copper-plate charters was avoided as far as possible; and that the office-copies of the edicts had also had the necessary instructions to the officials concerned.[33]

(5) State Revenue

The success of the administration of any government depends on the efficiency of the department of treasury or finance. This fact explains why in India the *kōśa* or the department of treasury has always been regarded as one of the chief *aṅgas* (limbs) of the state.[34] A rich treasury is all the more necessary, if the state, like that of the Vishṇukuṇḍis, is to engage itself repeatedly in the costly and long wars.[35] It should also be remembered that, according to the *smṛitis*, even though the treasury should not get exhausted in spite of the heavy expenditure of the state, yet the riches in it at the same time must have been acquired only by the lawful means and not by the immoral ones.[36] This idea is well reflected in the Vishṇukuṇḍi charters also.[37] The conquests by the Vishṇukuṇḍis must have brought to their treasury immense wealth and this kind of addition to the treasury by booty of wars is also approved by the *smṛitis*, though they put at times certain restrictions in this regard.[38] However, the primary source of revenue of the Vishṇukuṇḍi government, as in the case of all the other governments of ancient India, must have been different taxes alone. It is

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

likely that there had been many taxes prevalent, though only the following few find mention in the Vishṇukuṇḍi charters:

Kara:[39] According to the lexicographers and other writers, this term denotes tax in general to be collected from the cultivators of land and people of other professions.[40] But some take it in the sense of a tax paid in instalments by different *śrēṇis* or guilds.[41]

Bhāga:[42] This may be the same as *bhāgadhēya* of the lexicons,[43] and may denote the king's share of the produce of land, or the income from other sources to be paid by the cultivators, merchants, miners, gamblers, etc.[44]

Bhōga:[45] This word means literally 'enjoyment'. Hence, as a fiscal term it is likely to denote a tax for enjoyment or something like the expenditure tax of the modern times. This expression is also taken to mean 'property', 'jagir', etc.[46] Therefore as a revenue term it may also denote a sort of property tax. This is also held by some writers to denote different taxes in kind, enumerated in the *smṛitis*,[47] or the periodical supplies of fruits etc., which the villages were expected to offer to the king.[48]

Dāna. This word seems to indicate a road-cess or a customs-duty.[49]

Daṇḍa:[50] This may stand for the fines levied by the various departments and judiciary on offenders and culprits as prescribed in the *smṛitis* etc.[51]

Besides, the king's treasury had also a legitimate claim to the hidden treasures (*nidhi*) and deposits (*upanidhi*) discovered by the people.[52] This is suggested by the fact that the charters at times exempt[53] the gift-villages from surrendering the *nidhi* and *upanidhi*, to the king's treasury. Incidentally it may also be noted that the Vishṇukuṇḍi charters usually exempt the gift-villages from the payment of the *kara* alone and other exemptions are met with only in the Tummalagudem plates (I). This feature perhaps indicates how keen the administration was in collecting different taxes.

(6) Public Expenditure

The king, according to the ancient Indian ideal, collected taxes only for the manifold benefits of his subjects.[54] Hence, the Vishṇukuṇḍi kings seem to have spent from their treasury for beautifying different places by constructing new temples, monasteries, halls, etc., by excavating lakes etc., and by keeping the old ones in good repair. They also spent for the benefit of the poor, the helpless, the sick, and for propogating education by encouraging the learned and by constructing and organising the educational institutions.[55] They also spent huge amounts for performing great royal sacrifices like the *Aśvamēdha* to enhance the prestige of their kingdom. A part of the income seems to have gone for maintaining the *varṇāśrama-dharma*, for paying salary to the various royal servants and for keeping the members of the royal family in good relationship.[56] No doubt these items of expenditure must have been essential for effecting a good religious and social harmony among the subjects, for realising the political ambition of the kings and for maintaining the administrative efficiency.

However a good part of the state-income must have been taken away by the department of defence. The large number of warriors, the skilled generals, the huge and costly elephants and horses—all required in abundance for successful wars were to be acquired, trained, maintained and kept always ready and cheerful by the state.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

(7) Coinage

Already we had occasion to refer to some copper coins bearing on the obverse a lion and a symbol, which is identical to the central figure on the seal of the Ipur plates (I).[57] These coins bear on the reverse a *kalaśa* or a vase on a stand. They had been originally attributed to the Pallavas by scholars like Elliot,[58] Rapson,[59] Smith, etc.[60] But some scholars like Brown[61] raised a little doubt regarding this attribution. However on the basis that the lion was the crest of the Vishṇukuṇḍis, Venkayya and Krishna Sastri ascribed these coins to the Vishṇukuṇḍis.[62] The fact that many such coins have been unearthed not only in the southern part of the Andhra country but also in the northern part of it (*i.e.*, in the Vizagapatam District)[63] seems to support this contention. That is perhaps the reason why Dubreuil also ascribed these coins to the Vishṇukuṇḍis.[64] Since the days of that French scholar many coins of the said type have been discovered in the Nalgonda, Karimnagar, Guntur Districts of Andhra Pradesh and scholars have been unanimous in ascribing them to the Vishṇukuṇḍis.[65] We have seen earlier[66] the significance of the discovery of a few of similar coins in Pavner, Wardha District, Maharashtra.[67]

The coins thus attributed to the Vishṇukuṇḍis, though bear invariably on the obverse, the figure of a maned lion, have, on the reverse, either (1) a *kalaśa* or (2) a *śaṅkha*, or (3) a *chakra*.[68] Apart from these, two other types of coins have also been attributed to the Vishṇukuṇḍis. They bear a bull on the obverse and either (1) *śaṅkha*[69] or (2) *śūla*[70] on the reverse. However, it may be remembered that the figure of lion, on the basis of which the coins have been attributed to the Vishṇukuṇḍis, is conspicuously absent in the last mentioned two types. Some scholars have ventured to read *vi* or *ma* on some of these coins and *Vi-ka-ra-ma* on some others, and they take it for parts of the legend *Vikramēndra* of the Vishṇukuṇḍi king of that name. But, it is to be pointed out that the facsimiles of these coins illustrated bear no traces of letters.[71] Moreover it is difficult to understand why the weak Vikramēndravarman (either the first or the second of that name) alone should issue coins in his name while the powerful monarchs like Mādhavavarman, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman did not do so.

(8) Military Administration

We have already seen that the Vishṇukuṇḍi kings were the supreme commanders of their army. In fact, a major number of their records as well as those of their feudatories etc., had been issued from their respective military camps. The records stand witness to how the kings gave detailed instructions to their generals and how daring they had been in the battle fields.[72] We have also seen how the Vishṇukuṇḍis had been, in general, helped by their feudatories in the offensive and defensive wars.[73] So the strength of the Vishṇukuṇḍi army seems to have depended to a great extent, on the active support of the feudatories. Besides, the military convention of the age seems to indicate the prevalance of the practice of issuing charters in honour of a successful warrior,[74] and for the religious merit of a general who fell fighting bravely.[75] Again the special mentioning of the names of the places wherefrom the victorious regiments came was also in practice. All these were obviously to boost the morale of the fighting forces.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

According to the ancient Indian thought, the strength of an army and the success of the expedition it undertakes, depend on the number of the brave, mighty and well-equipped elephants led by able *māhuts*. We have seen already how the Vishṇukuṇḍis were specialising in elephant warfare, and how an indiscriminate use of the elephant force by Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman led to his defeat in a battle against the Maukharis in the Vindhya region.[76]

The Kandulapalem plates refers to a locality as *Chamūpurā*. As the lexicons recognise *purā* in the sense of 'a city' and 'east', the said expression has been taken earlier to be the name of a town adjacent to the gift village Tūṇḍi. However, it may be noted that *chamū* in classical Sanskrit means usually 'an army' or 'a division of an army'; and that *purā* means also 'a fortress'. Hence, it is not unlikely that *Chamūpurā* denotes a fortress with a division of the army. In that case it would appear that just like the contemporary Chālukya and the Pallava rulers, the Vishṇukuṇḍi kings too had realised the military importance of the fortresses. It is also likely that Vikramēndravarman II made the gift of Tūṇḍi when he was camping near the fortress.[77]

The Vishṇukuṇḍis were often engaged in wars on one reason or the other. Yet, the title *dharmavijayin*[78] (a conqueror of battles fought according to the code of the *Dharma*) of some of the kings seems to indicate that they had aimed at the ideals set up by the *smṛitis*, which condemn treacherous fight.[79] Kauṭilya too recommends an *adharma* (or *kūṭa*) *yuddha* (treacherous battle) only when there is no hope of winning a war by righteous means.[80] The charters issued by the kings from the war-fronts may remind us of the *smṛitis* according to which the booties of wars are to be donated to the Brāhmaṇas etc.[81] No doubt the Vishṇukuṇḍis were waging wars with their contemporary powers. But their relationship with the Vākāṭakas, the Rāshṭrakūṭas of Mānapura, the Chālukyas, the Kadambas and even with the Maukharis after c. 553 A.D. and with the Pallavas after 566 A.D. clearly show that the foreign policy of the Vishṇukuṇḍis was based on the principle of the traditional four-fold *upāyas* or means and not on the principle of wars and aggressions alone.

(9) Judiciary

Not much information regarding the administration of justice can be culled out from the Vishṇukuṇḍi records. However it may be observed that in ancient India though the king was usually the highest judicial authority, he did not enjoy complete freedom in the administration of justice. He had to appoint some qualified, impartial and scholarly Brāhmaṇas and other *sabhyas* with the help of whom, either directly or through a dependable proxy, he was expected to interpret the laws in such a way so that there might be no real conflict felt between two or more laws of the *Dharma*.[82] It is also stipulated that if there was a conflict between a principle of morality (*dharma-śāstra*) on one hand and that of politics (*artha-śāstra*) on the other, the former was to prevail upon the latter.[83]

The law-suits were decided usually by taking into account (1) the written documents, (2) the actual enjoyment of the disputed property, and (3) the witnesses. No doubt in addition to these three, the *smṛitis* also prescribe different *divyas* or ordeals to decide the suits. And Yuan Chwang stands witness to the fact that those ordeals

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

had been actually in practice in India during the period in question.[84] However, it must be clearly understood that the *smṛitis* stipulate that when none of the said three means helps even partially, then alone the ordeals are to be resorted to in both the criminal and civil suits.[85] That is why following many ancient Indian writers, a Vishṇukuṇḍi *praśastikāra* also is found praising his hero as administering justice in such a fashion that there was no necessity for the *divyas*.[86]

(ii) SOCIETY

(1) Four-Fold Division

Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi claims to have put an end to the *varṇasāṅkarya* or contamination of the four castes.[87] In his *Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā-bhāshya*, Śabarasvāmin (c. 200 A.D.) refers to the Kshatriyas who were not actually ruling, but were styling themselves as *rājan* and were living among the Andhras.[88] These authorities and the records of the early dynasties like those of the Bṛihatphalāyanas, Sālaṅkāyanas etc., indicate that, as in every other part of India, in Andhra also the four-fold division of the society was already an established fact even before the rise of Vishṇukuṇḍis. The members of the Vishṇukuṇḍi family and their feudatories too styled themselves as the guardians of the *varṇāśrama-dharma*. However the records betray that at times the rules of the *varṇāśrama-dharma* had not been strictly adhered to. Thus the Gaṅgas, though *dvijas* (perhaps Brāhmaṇas) had their names ending in *varman* like the Kshatriyas, and also had a *Kshatra-vṛitti* or a profession of the Kshatriyas.[89] Similarly the practice of inter-caste adoption of the issues among the Brāhmaṇas and Kshatriyas seems to have been hinted at by a record.[90] Again the marriage ties of the Vishṇukuṇḍis with the Vākāṭakas, Kadambas, Rāshṭrakūṭas, Pallavas, etc., may indicate the prevalence of the intercaste marriages at least between the royal families belonging to the Brāhmaṇa and Kshatriya castes. Possibly the ruling class, as a whole was viewed as the *rājan* or the Kshatriya caste, which was decided by one's Kshat riya parentage, or by the valour or the capacity to lead an army successfully in the war as stated in the *Mahābhārata*.[91] This idea seems to have had an echo in the grant of the Gaṅga Indravarman, whose family, though originally of the *dvijas* became Kshatriya on account of the last two qualities of its members,[92] as we have seen earlier.

Of the four castes, only Brāhmaṇas and Kshatriyas are mentioned in the records. However one among the twelve donees of the Māruṭūra grant is described as *varṇa-traya-nivṛitta* (*i.e.*, *a-traivarṇika*, 'member of the fourth caste'), though, as in the case of the other Brāhmaṇa donees of the record, his name too ended in *svāmin* and he too claimed Kāśyapa-gōtra.[93] Little information we have about how actually the members of the four castes were living. However, there is no doubt that each caste was given due encouragement by the kings so as to achieve a social harmony as we saw earlier. Again the records also give us to understand that the Brāhmaṇas were entirely engaged in the study of the scriptures and in the performance of the sacrifices enjoined therein. The life of the Brāhmaṇas was divided into four *āśramas* and that of the other *dvijas* into three.[94] The description of the person called Kapōta, the builder of the Kapōtēśvara temple at Chēzerla as a *Kapōtavṛitti* (one who is leading his life like a *kapōta* or a dove, *i.e.*, a *vānaprastha*) is quite interesting.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

(2) Women

The queen Paramabhaṭṭārikā enjoyed the freedom to build a monastery after her own name. Her description as one being superior to the goddess of wealth, as an illustrious mother of the illustrious son Mādhavarāja, as an exemplary daughter of the renowned father Pṛithivīmūla and as a distinguished queen of the powerful king Gōvindavarman[96] is really significant. The queen Kadambamahādēvī is portrayed as an ideal wife with the ideal chastity.[97] The last mentioned queen seems also to have accompanied her lord Pulakēśi II to the Kalūrapura battle-field, where her father died fighting. About the Ānanda princess Avanitalāntavatī we have no more information than that she was the beloved daughter of the Ānanda king Kandara and was the mother of Pṛithivīyuvarāja.[98] Regarding the ordinary women of the Andhra society of the period, the only information we get is that they besmeared their bodies with sandal paste, applied black pigment to their eye-lashes, painted themselves with red lac, wore long garlands, and had their dip in the Kṛishṇā river.[99] The young women of the city of Trivaranagara are specially described to have rejoiced very much, when the kings shifted the capital to that city and brought prosperity to the place. This perhaps indicates that they took some conspicuous part in the festivities celebrated to mark the occasion.[100]

(3) Village Life

On the basis of what little we know about the gift-villages, a general picture, though incomplete, of the village life in the Vishṇukuṇḍi dominions may be drawn. The records give us an impression that the villages were mainly agricultural in nature, though it is very likely that there were people of other walks of life also. The existence of the *grāmavṛiddha* and *rāshṭrakūṭa* suggests that the village administration was directly under the village council, like the modern village-*pañchāyat*. The administration of the Kapōtēśvara temple by a body of twelve *dēvakarmins* or temple officials referred to in the Chezerla record[101] may indicate a general practice of the administration of the temples in other places also. The individual villagers (*grāmēyakas*) and the heads of the families (*kuṭumbins*) were expected to know themselves of the changes in the policy of the central authority touching their respective villages. Hence, they were informed of the royal grants of their villages in favour of the donees. The fact that the boundaries of the villages were left not precisely defined in grants seems to indicate that the question of deciding the village boundaries was left to the general and age-old practice only and there was no boundary dispute of serious nature.

The villagers were to pay to the king's treasury different taxes including those enumerated above. The taxes seem to have been classified as annual and periodical. The former probably went to the king's royal treasury while the latter might have been utilised for the remuneration of the *grāmikas* or the heads of the villages following the custom shown in the *smṛitis*.[102] Besides, as in every other kingdom of ancient India, in the Vishṇukuṇḍi dominions also it seems to have been obligatory on the part of the villages to pay some contribution of supplies, whenever the royal battalions consisting of the regular and irregular soldiers (*chāṭas* and *bhaṭas*) were passing by.[103] This is, obviously, a sort of forced contribution and it is condemned by

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

the *smṛitis*.[101] Similarly the villagers were also obliged to render to the king occasionally labour without payment. This is a sort of forced labour and is referred to usually *vishṭi*.[105] Perhaps the same is meant by the expression *vachana-prēshaṇa* in a Vishṇukuṇḍi record.[106] The villages, gifted by the kings were exempted from many of the taxes and the services, in favour of the donees. The villages, thus gifted were designated as *agrahāra* or *bhaṭṭagrāma*.[107] At times the gifts were named after their respective donors. Thus the gift by *Janāśraya* Mādhavavarman was called as *Janāśrayadatti* and that by *Sarvasiddhi* Jayasiṁha as *Sarvasiddhidatti*.[108] These remind us of the *apūrvadatti* 'new gift' of the Vākāṭaka records.[109] Perhaps *paradatti* of the Pallava epigraphs including the Chezerla inscription is also of the same import.[110]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. See Ch. IV, sect. ii; Ch. V, sect. iii; Appendix VIII.
2. Ch. IV, sect. iii; Ch. V, sect. i-iii.
3. Cf. Mādhavavarman's epithet *dēvātidēva* and see Appendix III for a discussion on this epithet.
4. Cf. *bhagavach-Chhrīparvatasvāmipād-ānudh-ānyāvāpta-prajā-pālan-ādhikārāṇām* in No. VIII, line 2. A similar claim was made by the contemporary Kadamba kings also. See EI, VI, pp. 14, 18; VIII, p. 147; etc.
5. Cf. *kar-ādāna-prayuktatvāch=cha prajāpālanasya* in the *Aparārka* under *Yājña* I, 366.
6. Nos. I, lines 2-6, 11, 12; VIII, line 5; X, lines 4, 15 ; XI, lines 6-7 ; etc.
7. See *e.g.* Ch. IV, sect. i; Ch. V, sect. i, ii, iii; Ch. VI, sect. i, ii.
8. This fact may incidentally add some strength to the suggestion that the Tummalagudem set I may be the earliest or one of the earliest of the records of the dynasty.
9. *Manu.*, VII, verse 55; *sahāyasādhyaṁ rājatvaṁ chakram-ēkaṁ na varttatē. Artha.*, p. 13.
10. *Artha.*, p. 256.
11. See Ch. V, sect. iii.
12. No. X, line 18.
13. See SII, I, p. 127; etc.
14. No. I, line 25; etc.
15. See No. IV, line 31 and note thereon.
16. KHD, II, i, p. 77. For different derivations of the word *kāyastha* see BV, X, p. 284; EI, XXV pp. 271, 277.
17. No. I, line 25.
18. SS. pp. 190, 210.
19. No. XIII, line 26.
20. See *Yājña.* I, verses 319-20 and the *Mitākshara* thereunder.
21. Ch. VI, sect. ii.
22. No. I, line 25.
23. For a similar usage see EI, XXVI, pp. 202, 206; etc.
24. CII, III, p. 96, line 13, p. 115, line 15.
25. IEG, s.v.
26. EI, IX, pp. 56, 132, 377.
27. No. XVII, lines 13-14.
28. See *Nāma.* II, i, verse 8 and the commentaries thereunder.
29. Cf. *Daśa.* p. 120. Kale takes the word in the sense of 'a sheriff'. See ibid. notes thereunder.
30. No. XII, line 15.
31. Daṇḍin's *grihapati* is explained as *grāmādhyaksha*. See *Daśa.* p. 120 and the commentary thereunder.
32. See No. II, line 1 and note thereon.
33. See Nos. VI, line 16; VII, lines 23-24 and the respective notes thereon.
34. *Yājña.*, I, verse 353; *Nāma.* II, viii, verses 17-18.
35. Cf. *Vittavān=ēva sahatē sudīrgham=api vigraham* in *Vīra. Rāja.*, p. 257. See also *Artha.* p. 242.
36. See *e.g. Yājña.*, I, verses 317, 340; *Artha.*, p. 258.
37. See Nos. I, lines 10; VIII, lines 27-28; etc.
38. See *e g. Manu.*, VII, verses 96 ff.
39. Nos. VI, line 8; X, line 27.
40. See *Nāma.*, II, viii, verse 27, and the commentaries thereunder.
41. Cf. *kīryatē, vibhajya kshipyatē, Śrēṇibhiḥ iti karaḥ.* See the commentary *Amarapadavivṛiti* (Adyar Library Ed., 1971, p. 499) on the above.
42. No. I, line 24.
43. *Nāma.* II, viii, verse 27.
44. See *Manu.* VII, verses 130 ff; *Yājña.* II, verses 199 ff; *Artha.* pp. 81 ff.
45. No. I, line 25.
46. See *Nāma.* III, iii, verse 23 and commentaries thereunder.
47. See *Manu.* VII, verses 130-32; CII, IV, p. 250, n.
48. IEG, s.v.
49. See No. VIII, line 32 and note thereon.
50. No. I, line 24.
51. See *e.g. Yājña.* II, verses 204 ff; *Artha.*, pp. 65 ff; etc.
52. See *Manu.* VIII, verses 35 ff; *Yājña.* II, verses 34 ff.
53. No. I, line 24.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

54. See *Raghu.*, I, verse 18.
55. Nos. I, lines 8-12; VIII, lines 4-5, 24-26; IX, lines 18-19; X, lines 13-14.
56. No. I, line 6.
57. Ch. II, sect. ii.
58. *Coins of Southern India*, p. 152 B, and plate II, coin Nos. 49-50.
59. *Indian Coins*, p. 37, and plate V, coin No. 16.
60. SEHI, p. xii, and plate, coin No. 16.
61. *The Coins of India*, p., 62 n. and plate VII, coin No. 8.
62. ARE, 1909, pp 4, 109.
63. Ibid.
64. *The Pallavas*, p. 34; AHD, p. 92.
65. APGAS, No. 8, pp. 45 ff; No. 10, pp. 33 ff; No. 14, pp. 55 ff; JNSI, XXVIII, pp. 38 ff.
66. Ch. V, sect. iii.
67. JNSI, XXVI, pp. 240 ff; XXVIII, pp. 164 ff.
68. Ibid. XXVIII, pp. 38 ff; 164 ff.
69. Ibid. p. 40.
70. APGAS, No. 8, pp. 45 ff.
71. Even Rapson's coin (above note 59) does not show any writing.
72. Nos. II, XI, XVI, XVIII.
73. Above Ch. IV, VI, VII, VIII.
74. Above Ch. VII, sect. i, ii.
75. Above Ch. VIII, sect. i, ii.
76. Ibid. sect, iii; Ch. V, sect. iii.
77. Cf. the construction *Chamūpurā-pārśvē=smābhiḥ* (see No. IX, lines 28-29 and notes thereon). For references to the Chālukyan and the Pallava fortresses see respectively EI, XXVII, p. 9; VI, p. 6, verse 29.
78. No. VIII. line 15.
79. See e.g. *Manu.*, VII, verses 90-98.
80. *Artha.*, p. 366. The intended reading there is obviously *viparyayē kūṭa-yuddham.*
81. See *e.g. Yājña.*, I, verse 323.
82. See *e.g.* ibid., II verses 1 ff.
83. Ibid. verse 21.
84. See Watters, op. cit., I, p. 172.
85. See *Yājña.* II, verse 22 and commentaries thereunder for quotations from many other law-books to the same effect.
86. See No. X, line 8. See also Appendix VIII. Cf. SS, pp. 127 ff., pp. 354 ff; ED, p. 541 ff.
87. EI, VIII, p. 60, line 6.
88. See under the *Mīmāṁsa-sūtra*, II, iii, 3.
89. See Ch. VII, sect. ii.
90. Ch. II, sect. iii.
91. See above Ch. II, sect. iii and note 86; MB, *Ādi*, Ch. 126, verse 34.
92. Cf. *dharma-krama-vikramāṇām=anyatama-yōgād=avāpta - bhūmaṇḍal - ādhipatyaiḥ* in No. XIII, lines 19-20. Here *dharma* (*i.e.*, the law of family succession), *krama* (*i.e.*, *parākrama* or valour) and *vikrama* (*i.e.*, overpowering) seem to stand respectively for the ideas indicated by the expressions *tat-kulīnaḥ, śūraḥ* and *sēnāṁ yaś=cha prakarshati* of the MB, referred to above. See also PSED, s.v. *krama.*
93. No. XVI, line 30. The expression should ordinarily denote a person who had come out *i.e.*, excommunicated from the *trivarṇas* or the first three castes. But the excommunication had been considered as a serious thing and it would have been possible only in the case of a person committing great sins for which no *prāyaśchitta* is possible. Hence it seems extremely doubtful whether such a sinner would have been included in the list of honourable donees.
94. No. IV, line 4.
95. See above Ch. VIII, sect. iii.
96. No. VIII, lines 18-29.
97. No. XVI, lines 15-17.
98. No. XVIII, lines 11-12.
99. See ibid, lines 5-8 and notes thereon.
100. Ch. IV. sect. ii; Appendix IV.
101. See Ch. VIII, sect. iii.
102. *Manu.*, VII, verses 118, 131-32.
103. See above sect. i (4). See also CII, III, p. 98 and n. 2.
104. See *e.g. Yājña.*, I, verse 336.
105. See No. I, line 24.
106. See No. VI, line 10.
107. Nos IV, line 19; VI, lines 8; X, line 27; XVII, line 20.
108. Nos. X, line 27; XVII, line 20.
109. See *e.g.* CII, V, pp. 7-8, text lines 14-15; etc.
110. See No. XVIII, line 92. Also see SII, II, p. 353, text line 133; p. 509, text line 63. Like *apūrva*, the word *para* is also an antonym of *pūrva* 'old'. Hence can *para-datti* be taken to be the same as *apūrva-datti* or a grant newly made ? Or can *para-datti* be a wrong re-Sanskritised form of the Tamil *piradatti* from the original Sanskrit *pradatti* 'grant' ? Or does *para-datti* simply mean 'superior grant'. See SII, II, p. 361; ASLP, p. 143. Cf. SII, II, pp. xiii, 512; EI, XXXVI, p. 145.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CHAPTER X

RELIGION, EDUCATION, ART AND ARCHITECTURE UNDER THE VISHṆUKUṆḌIS

(i) RELIGION

THE main religions of India of the age were Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism. While the Vishṇukuṇḍi kings were staunch followers of the Vedic religion, some of their records are in fact Buddhistic in nature and stand witness to the liberal policy of religious tolerance of the kings. But at the same time it is strange that there is no direct evidence to show whether there existed actually any Jain temple or monastery in the Vishṇukuṇḍi kingdom.

(1) HINDUISM

The triumph of the *sanātana-dharma* (the orthodox religion as established by the *śrutis* and *smṛitis*)[1] over Buddhism during the age is clear from the records of the Vishṇukuṇḍis and their feudatories and the other contemporaries. We have already seen that Gōvindavarman I, a Buddhist to begin with, embraced Hinduism, perhaps under the influence of the Vākāṭaka Pravarasēna II. The list of the great Vedic sacrifices which Mādhavavarman II claims to have performed surpasses even the one found in the Vākāṭaka records and is unique. The significance of these sacrifices in the context of the Vishṇukuṇḍi history is dealt with separately.[2]

It may be noted that the *Upanishads* insist that besides performing the Vedic rituals, every ordinary man should also worship deities (*dēvat-ōpāsanā.*)[3] So the Vishṇukuṇḍis like other Indian kings gave also importance to the worship of the deities. They were Śaivas by conviction[4] and some of them actually styled themselves as *parama-māhēśvaras*. Their family deity was called Śrīparvatasvāmin, to be identified with the god Mallikārjuna (Śiva of the modern Śrīśailam). Their inscriptions contain reference to other Śaiva deities also. The Velpuru inscription speaks of the worship of the elephant-faced god Vināyaka. Probably it is one of the earliest of the records in South India to refer to that deity, though the popularity of the worship of that deity in much earlier time is known from the terracotta seal of Vināyaka of the Kushāṇa age[5] and from the *Yājñavalkyasmṛiti*.[6]

The worship of Śiva with his consort Pārvatī is indicated by the Chikkulla plates granting a village to the Three-eyed god (*Tryambaka*), named Sōmagirē (or rī) śvarānātha, Sōmagirīśvarā being obviously the name (*i.e.*, the local name) of the goddess Pārvatī.[7] The above name of Śiva reminds us of the name Kālapriyānātha (*i.e.*, Śiva as a husband of Kālapriyā, *i.e.*, Ambikā or Kālī) of Bhavabhūti's dramas,[8] and the name Pārvatīsvāmin (*i.e.*, Śiva as a husband of Pārvatī)[9] of a Goa inscription assignable to the fifth century A.D. Similarly the Chezerla inscription also seems to suggest the deity Kapōtēśvara in the Chēzerla temple was perhaps in the form of Umā-Mahēśvara.[10] There are legends connecting the god Kapōtēśvara, with the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

story of the emperor Śibi famous in the epics for his inimitable sacrifice to save a *kapōta* or pigeon; and they praise the god as a benefactor of that emperor.[11] However the said inscription seems to call the god Achalēśvara himself by the name Kapōtēśvara because of the fact that the temple of the deity was built by one Kapōta.[12] Thus on the basis of the Chezerla record one may deduce that the legends referred to above are of later origin born simply to explain the name Kapōtēśvara mythologically.

There is no reference to the worship of any Vaishṇava deity in the records, though there are references to Vishṇu, Gōvinda (*i.e.*, Vishṇu-Kṛishṇa),[13] and to Muraripu (*i.e.*, Vishṇu) mounted on Garuḍa.[14] However, the facts that many of the Vishṇukuṇḍi kings were named after the Vaishṇava gods, *viz.*, Mādhava and Gōvinda; that some caves like the one at Mogalrājapuram were meant for the worship of the Hindu Trinity (*i.e.*, Brahmā, Vishṇu and Śiva); and that the figure in the central chaitya window of the said cave is actually Lakshmī-Nārāyaṇa indicate that the worship of Vishṇu was also popular.

(2) Buddhism

Before the advent of the Vishṇukuṇḍis, the Andhra country had several Buddhist establishments in places like Amarāvati, Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, Yēlēśwaram, Kēsānapalle, Jaggayyapēṭa, Guṇṭupalle, etc. Yuan Chwang, who visited the country soon after the disappearance of the Vishṇukuṇḍis informs us of the existence of some twenty Buddhist monasteries with more than 3000 brethren in the area.[15] But the records of the Vishṇukuṇḍi period speak of only two monasteries—one at Indrapura and the other at Guṇapāśapura. The reason for this phenomenon is not difficult to surmise. For, in spite of the great pain taken by Yuan Chwang in drawing a bright picture of Buddhism in India, his records do betray the fact that the progress of the religion of the Buddha had already been arrested.[16] Even in the Dhānyakaṭaka country most of the Buddhist *vihāras* had been deserted and only twenty of them were in use while there were hundred flourishing Dēva-temples. Even the way to the Śrīparvata monastery had become unknown.[17]

In spite of all these, the Tummalagudem records reveal the vigour with which the religion was maintaining itself against all odds. The Buddhist authors of these records would not refer to Indrabhaṭṭāraka's establishment of the *ghaṭikās* for the propagation of the Vedic studies and to his getting religious merit therefrom as mentioned in other records.[18] But at the same time they would be careful enough not to omit mentioning the best religious merit (*brāhma-pūṇya*) acquired by Gōvindavarman I by building lofty and big *vihāras*.[19] Similarly they would not believe that the *Aśvamēdhas* etc., being mere *kāmya-karmas*, Mādhavavarman II could have purified the world of its sins by performing them.[20] On the contrary they would believe that the *bōdhichitta* of Gōvindavarman I and his gift to the Buddhist monks would protect all the creatures.[21]

Besides, the Tummalagudem records contain reference to some of the basic Mahāyāna ethics and doctrines. An epithet of Gōvindavarman I, *viz.*, *uttpāditamahābōdhichitta* is based on the doctrine of Bōdhisattva which is the key note of the Mahāyāna teachings. According to this, anyone who develops *bōdhichitta* (or the Heart of Enlightenment) for the welfare of all creatures is a Bōdhisattva or

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

one who is destined to become a Buddha in the long run.[22] The triple formula of the ten *Balas*, the four *Vaiśārdyas* and the eighteen *Āvēṇikadharmas* found in the record constitute the basic definition of a Buddha according to Mahāyānism. A reference to the other two *lakshaṇas* of a Buddha, *viz.*, *karuṇā* or compassion for all beings suffering in many ways, and a body with the thirty-two *lakshaṇas* or special characteristics is also found in the record.[23] There is also an echo of another Mahāyāna doctrine according to which the realisation of the *dharmaśūnyatā* (*i.e.*, non-existence of the objective world) alone removes the veil of covering of the *jñyēya* (truth) and enables the *sādhaka* to attain perfect knowledge.[24]

Though in the early period of the Mahāyāna school there was no text prescribing code of conduct for the monks of the sect,[25] the inscriptions under study seem to suggest that the monks should have firm faith in the Buddha and in his teachings and should study the scriptures and practise meditation.[26] It may be observed here that more or less on the same principles the later works like *Śikshāsamuchchaya*, *Bōdhicharyā-samuchchaya* etc. (c. 7-8th century A.D.) of the sect seem to have been composed. It may also be of interest to note that the author of the said works, *viz.*, Śāntidēva is credited with the achievement of converting to Buddhism, many persons including the Śaivas of the Śrīparvata of the south,[27] *i.e.*, a place not far from Indrapura where the Paramabhaṭṭārikā monastery was located. Generally the works of the Mahāyānists praise their own *Bōdhisattva-yāna* and condemn the *Śrāvaka* and the *Pratyēkabuddhayānas* and group them under single name Hīnayāna.[28] However, the Tummalagudem record not only speaks of the three *yānas* or paths, by following the *Dharmasaṅgraha* tradition, but also gives us to understand that the monkish community of the Indrabhaṭṭārikāmahāvihāra consisted of the monks of all the three *yānas*.[29] It may be pointed out that Yuan Chwang too records that both the Hīnayānists and the Mahāyānists resided together in a good number of monasteries, obviously following some common regulations of the monastic order.[30]

It is also interesting to note that even though many *vihāras* of the area were being deserted during the period as recorded by Yuan Chwang, the prince Harivarman, the son of Pṛithivīmūla, built, at the same time, a new monastery at Guṇapāśapura, and probably dedicated it to the monks of Tāmbraparṇī or Ceylon.[31] This reminds us of the construction of a *Siṁhala-vihāra* and of the dedication of a *chaitya-gṛiha* to the *Thērīyas* of Tāmbraparṇī, both mentioned in the Ikshvāku inscriptions (3rd century A.D.) from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa.[32] All these indicate that the Buddhist fraternal bond between the Isle of Ceylon and the Kṛishṇā delta continued at least till the sixth century A D., obviously because of the uninterrupted maritime trade contacts between these two places, through these centuries.

(3) Jainism

As we have already pointed out, none of the records of the Vishṇukuṇḍi kingdom throws any light on the state of Jainism of the area during the period. The same is the case with the Vākāṭaka records also. This fact may indicate that as in the Central India, the religion of Vardhamāna did not attract many followers in Andhra also, as it was able to do in the adjacent countries like, Kaliṅga in the north, Karṇāṭaka in the west and the Tamil country in the south. The age of the antiquities, ascribed to Jainism,[33] found in the Vēṅgī country has not yet so far been fixed with

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

any amount of certainty. It is very likely that a great majority of them belong to the post Vishṇukuṇḍi age. All the traditions speaking of the Jainas in Andhra are definitely of much later date, *i.e.*, 10th century or still later.[34] The earliest record to speak of a Jaina establishment in the Vēṅgī country belongs to the time of the Eastern Chālukya Vishṇuvardhana III and is dated Śaka 684 (762 A.D.). This epigraph, it is generally held, confirms a much earlier grant of the village Musinikoṇḍa made by Kubja Vishṇuvardhana's queen Ayyanamahādēvī in favour of the Jaina establishment Maḍumbi-vasati in Vijayavāḍa. As the language of the record is very corrupt, it is doubtful whether the said queen herself built the *vasati* afresh and made grants to it or she simply made a grant to a *vasati* already in existence.[35] If the second alternative, perhaps the more probable one is proved to be correct by future researches, it may atleast indicate that there was a Jaina establishment at Vijayavāḍa even before the Eastern Chālukyas entered the region, *i.e.*, during the time of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. Yet, we have nothing to show how far it was enjoying the support of the kings and the public.

(ii) EDUCATION

The records of the period help us also to understand something about the condition of education in the Vishṇukuṇḍi period. As we have already seen, Gōvindavarman I was a master of many treatises and encouraged scholars. Vikramēndravarman I was himself a poet. Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman organised *ghaṭikās* for the propagation of education. Mādhavavarman IV *Janāśraya* also encouraged scholars and was the patron of the author Gaṇasvāmin who named his work *Chhandōvichiti* after the title of his benefactor, *viz.*, *Janāśraya*.[36] Pṛithivīmūla had studied the *śrutis* and *smṛitis* and knew their import.[37] Pṛithivīyuvarāja could take part in the learned discussions of the scholars.[33] The Pallava Mahēndravarman's scholarship and his drama *Mattavilāsaprahasana*, a farce, are well known.

Besides, the attributes of the donees of the grants also throw some light on the subject. Some of them claim to have learnt four or two Vēdas,[39] while some others were proficient in the Vēdas and *Vēdāṅgas* or in the *śrutis* and *smṛitis*.[40] Coming to the individual *śākhās* of the Vedic lore, the *Taittirīya śākhā* of the Kṛishṇa Yajurvēda is often mentioned.[41] There were also *Chhandōgas* or students of the Sāmavēda.[42] Strangely enough none of the records, we are concerned with, contains reference to the Ṛigvēda and the Śukla Yajurvēda. The study of the Atharvan has always been rare. That is why Pṛithivīmūla, probably to popularise its study, granted a whole village in the Gōdāvarī delta in favour of some 43 scholar-teachers of that Vēda by issuing the Godavari plates (I). His grant thus reminds us of the Basim plates of the Vākāṭaka king Vindhyaśakti II granting a village in favour of fourteen Atharvan scholars.[43] Evidently both the rulers colonised the Atharvavēdins within their respective kingdoms. It may be of interest to note even the late authors like Amalānanda (1300 A.D.) and Appayyadīkshita (17th century) refer to the study of the Atharvan in the *Ghaṭikās* of the Gōdāvarī delta.[44]

Of the ritualistic literature only the *Āpastamba-sūtra* finds mention.[45] However, a study of the Vishṇukuṇḍi records would show how carefully the drafters of those records must have studied other *śrautasūtras* also.[46] Apart from the *Karma-kāṇḍa* (*i.e.*, the ritualistic part of the Vēdas) the *Upanishads* (*i.e.*, the philosophical part of

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

the Vēdas) were also considered to be a separate branch of learning. There were also scholars in the *darśanas* like the *Nyāya* (philosophy of Gautama) and the *yōga* (philosophy of Patañjali).[47] Besides, the *Purāṇas*, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Dharmaśāstras* were also considered as separate and important branches of learning.[48]

We also meet with the expressions like *Sahasra*, *Trisahasra-vidyā*, *Aśīti-tārka*, *Sahasra-tārka* and *Chatuḥshashṭi* denoting different branches of learning which some of the donees or their forefathers claim to have mastered. One donee claims to have written or explained what is called *Viṁśati*. All these may be identified tentatively as follows:

The expression *Sahasra*[49] in similar context has been taken elsewhere to mean "the Sāmavēda which is supposed to contain 1000 branches".[50] But the expression *dvivēdāya gṛihīta-sāhasrāya*, instead of something like *trivēdāya* seems to indicate that the word *Sahasra* has been used in a different meaning. Moreover, the usual word to refer to a scholar of the Sāmavēda is *Chhandōga* which is also found along with the expression under question.[51] Therefore the *Sahasra* or 'The Thousand' may be something like the *Bṛihatīsahasra* etc.,[52] forming a considerable body of the *Mahāvrata* and the *Mahaduktha* hymns to be chanted while constructing the fire-altar of the bird-like shape, with 1000 bricks of different shapes, for the *Agnichayana* sacrifice as stated in the *Brāhmaṇas*. The construction of the said altar is the most complicated and most recondite of all the *Śrauta* sacrifices and the collection of the above mentioned hymns came to be regarded as a new *Saṁhitā* itself, through the arrangement of the verses, and it was regarded as the most sacred and secret.[53] Hence, it is specially mentioned as the *Sahasra* in the record. Similarly the *Trisahasra-vidyā* or 'the Science or Theology of the Three Thousands' may be similar collection of hymns to be chanted at the time of constructing the fire altar of the said type, but with 3000 bricks when the *Agnichayana* is to be performed for the third time by a person, as stated in the *Saṁhitās*.[54]

The *Aśīti-tārka* is same as the *Aśīti-tarka* of the Peddamaddali plates of the Eastern Chālukya Jayasiṁha[55] published as early as 1884. The later term too still remains to be properly explained. In this connection it is good to bear in mind the following. It is well known that the *Nyāya* and the *Vaiśēshika* philosophies are together well known as *Tarka-śāstra* among the scholars, though the word *tarka* can denote the six *darśanas* in general. It may also be noted that the *Nyāya-darśana* deals with sixteen *padārthas* or categories which are sub-divided again broadly into 45 by Gautama in the first chapter of his *sūtras*. Similarly, the *Vaiśēshika-darśana* deals with six *padārthas* which are also sub-divided into 35 by Kaṇāda in his *sūtras*.[56] So the expression *Aśīti-tārkaka* of the record [57] may denote a scholar of the *Tarka-śāstra* (dealing with) eighty categories (45+35=80.)[58]

Similarly the *Sahasra-tārka* also may be identified. It may be pointed out that the *Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā-darśana* is also correctly a *Tarka-śāstra*.[59] That *darśana*, as commented upon by Śabarasvāmin contains 893 *adhikaraṇas* or topics based on as many *tarkas* or *nyāyas*. The *Yōga-darśana*, which is also one of the six *vaidika-darśanas* or *tarkas* is concerned with twenty-seven categories[60] and its study was popular in Andhra as we have seen earlier. All these together with the above mentioned 80

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

tarkas make 1000 (*i.e.* 893+27+80=1000). Therefore *Sahasra-tārkaka* of the record[61] may denote a scholar of 1000 *Tarkas* or of the *Mīmāṁsā, Nyāya, Vaiśēshika* and *Yōgadarśanas*.

Viṁśati of the expression *Viṁśati-vyākhyāna* obviously denotes a group of twenty units like chapters.[61a] It may be noted that the twelve chapters of the *Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā* together with the four chapters of its supplement called *Dēvatākāṇḍa* or *Saṁkarsha-kāṇḍa* of Jaimini himself and four chapters of the *Uttara-Mīmāṁsā* or the *Vēdānta-darśana* make twenty chapters. Hence the expression *Viṁśati-vyākhyāna* may denote a teacher or a commentator of the Twenty chapters *i.e.*, the *Pūrv-ōttara-Mīmāṁsā-dārśanas*.[62] Thus it would appear that excepting the *Śāṁkhya-darśana* all the other five *vaidika-darśanas* were studied in the Vēṅgī country during the period.[63]

The expression *Chatuḥ-shashṭi*[61] no doubt denotes the practical and fine arts which are well known to have been divided into sixty-four branches in the ancient Indian tradition.[65] It is likely that these and similar subjects had been taught in the educational institutions like the *ghaṭikās* run by the kings. There the students were examined in their respective subjects by asking questions according to what was known as *ghaṭikā-mārga* or lot system, and the successful candidates were given proficiency certificate. The *ghaṭikās* of Vēṅgī, like their counterpart at Kāñchī must have been under the supervision of the royal officers. The Talagunda inscription seems to indicate that the *ghaṭikā* at Kāñchī had been managed by the officer in charge of the Pallava cavalry with whom Mayūraśarman, the Kadamba, quarrelled bitterly perhaps in connection with an examination for the proficiency certificate, and who is hence referred to in the said record as a cavalier (*aśvasaṁstha*) by the author of that record, evidently with contempt. (See Appendix VI).

That the study of the Buddhist theological works was not at all neglected by the Buddhists is also vouched for by the texts of the Tummalagudem records. There is nothing to show us the achievement of the Vēṅgī country during the period in the field of the classical literature in general. However, there is the *Jānāśrayī Chhandōvichiti* and it is one of the early works entirely devoted to the Sanskrit metrics. Critics speak highly of this work.[65a] So it may not be unreasonable to assume that such a work might not have been produced in the land and the age barren of literary activities which alone could demand such a treatise. Again, the language of the Vishṇukuṇḍi records, are simple, chaste and direct and are almost free from errors. The *ōjas* or the long compounds of the records in general, the beautiful description of Paramabhaṭṭārikā Mahādēvī in the Tummalagudem plates, the striking *ślēsha* of the Polamuru charter (I) and the pleasing aliteration and diction of the Chezerla record—all, not unworthy of writers like Bāṇabhaṭṭa of the north may be viewed as the only available specimens of the literary works of the country during the age.

(III) ART AND ARCHITECTURE

The early monuments at places like Amarāvatī, Jagayyapēṭa, Yēlēśvaram etc, show that Andhra had a school of art and architecture of its own even before the advent of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. The members of the family as we have seen often, came in close contact with the rulers of the dynasties such as the Vākāṭakas, the Chālukyas and the Pallavas who are known to have patronised art and architecture. The Vishṇukuṇḍi charters from Tummalagudem tell us that Gōvindavarman I did

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

evince great interest in the building activities. New temples and monasteries etc., were built and the old ones were kept in good repairs during his time. His successors also seem to have followed the same policy. The Velpuru pillar, bearing an inscription of Mādhavavarman II, stands as an evidence to the construction of the temple of Vināyaka though that temple is unfortunately not preserved. Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman too is known to have established centres of advanced studies evidently by constructing buildings necessary for the purpose. It is also likely that the temple of Sōmagirē (or rī) śvarānātha of the Chikkulla plates owed its origin to the workmen of the Vishṇukuṇḍi period. The Godavari plates (II) testifies that the construction activities were patronised in Andhra even by the kings like Pṛithivīmūla. If all these facts are taken into account, then it may not be fair to set aside altogether the theory of Dubreuil ascribing the cave temples at Uṇḍavalli (Guntur district), Mogalrājapuram and Vijayavāḍa (both in Krishna district) to the Vishṇukuṇḍis on the basis of the Vishṇukuṇḍi emblems (*viz.*, the images of lion and vase) which the caves contain.[66]

Though the said theory has gained support of the subsequent writers[67] there are other scholars according to whom the said caves owe their origin to other dynasties, *viz.*, the Andhra Sātavāhanas,[68] the Pallavas, [69] or the Chālukyas of Vēṅgī.[70] All the scholars cite their own reasons in support of their respective theories. These uncompromisingly opposite views among the scholars seem to indicate that so far no one is able to arrive at any clinching architectural evidence acceptable to all so that these caves could be decisively attributed to one dynasty or the other.[71] Taking recourse to the circumstantial evidences, it is argued that if at all these caves are to be ascribed to the Vishṇukuṇḍis, they have to be assigned to the period of the last Mādhavavarman, and that king, however, had hardly any time to devote in such activities.[72] But, this argument draws actually a blank cheque in view of the political history of the dynasty we have studied above, and in view of the continued building activities of almost all the members of the dynasty as we have seen earlier. The early Chālukyas too were always engaged in wars. Yet the temple building activities went on uninterrupted. Again we should not also forget that Mahēndravarman was actually in possession of the southern Vēṅgī country as far as the Kolēru lake.[73] How can then one exclude the probability of that Pallava king's authorship of the Mogalrājapuram caves,[74] especially as these caves are believed to contain Pallava features especially of Mahēndravarman ?[75] The *biruda utpattipiḍugu* found in the caves at Vijayavāḍa, Uṇḍavalli and Bhokardan (Aurangabad district, Maharashtra) has been taken as indicative of the common authorship of all the said cave temples. It is believed that since Bhokardan cave temple is to be ordinarily ascribed to the Chālukyas and not to the Vishṇukuṇḍis etc., all the above mentioned cave temples are to be assigned to the early Chālukyas only.[76] But it must be noted that on the basis of palaeography, the epigraphists have assigned the inscriptions, including the one containing the said *biruda* in the Uṇḍavalli caves to the 10th century[77] *i.e.*, a period much later than the one to which all the scholars would assign these cave temples. Hence it is doubtful whether the said *biruda* could decide the issue.[78] Before concluding it is good to bear in mind the following points:

(1) Even if the characters of the said Vijayavāḍa, Uṇḍavalli and Bhokardan cave

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

temple inscriptions are assigned to the 7th century A.D., as some would have[79] with a view to assign these temples to the early Chālukyas, the question of the cave temples at Mogalrājapuram seems to be rather different as there is no such inscription.

(2) The last quarter of the sixth century witnessed the abnormal activities in the field of constructing rock-cut cave temples in South India under the patronage of both the Chālukyas in Karṇāṭaka and the Pallavas in Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam. We have also seen that the Vishṇukuṇḍis were friendly neighbouers of both the said dynasties during that period. Hence one should ordinarily expect some activities in the same field under the Vishṇukuṇḍis in the Vēṅgī country also.

3) Maybe there are Pallava features of Mahēndravarman stamp and the early Chālukyan features in the said caves. But what we should not loose sight of is the fact that the period during which Mahēndravarman was holding the southern Vēṅgī area, *i.e.*, between 612 and 616 A.D. was not only a short one but also was featured with political unrest due to the sudden disappearance of the Vishṇukuṇḍi power as we have seen earlier. Hence one is to think twice before assigning the cave to that Pallava monarch. Again we find just on the top of the triple-celled cave at Mogalrājapuram a figure of Naṭarāja (*i.e.*, dancing Śiva) with eight hands. This Naṭarāja is in the *ūrdhvajānu* pose and is tampering Apasmārapurusha. It is rather unique and nowhere else is found including in the caves of Mahēndravarman, though there had been space enough for similar representation above the caves of that monarch at places like Maṇḍagappaṭṭu, Māmaṇḍūr, Daḷavanūr, etc.[80] The Naṭarāja figure found in the Śīyamaṅgalam cave temple of Mahēndravarman is altogether of a different type and occurs in different context.[81] Similarly, though the front towers of the temples like the Huchimalliguḍi at Aihole and the Virūpāksha and Mallikārjuna temples at Paṭṭadakal built by the Chālukyas have representations of Naṭēśa with many arms, the pose of them is altogether different and those Naṭēśas do not have *apasmāra* below but have bull behind.[82] Moreover, no Chālukyan cave-temple seems to have been built with three cells, located side by side in a straight line, and dedicated to the *Trimūrtis*, as we find in the Mogalrājapuram cave.

Considering all these facts it may be logical to ascribe the unique cave at least to the Vishṇukuṇḍis rather than to any one else.

None of the structural temples of the Vishṇukuṇḍis has come to us. We have already referred to the Vināyaka temple constructed during the time of Mādhavavarman II. We have nothing to decide whether the Sōmagirēśvarānātha temple was a cave temple or a structural one. Hence the only available structure of the period, *viz.*, the temple of Kapōtēśvara at Chēzerala[83] demands our attention in this context. On the grounds (1) that the main shrine of the temple is a long apsidal-ended building, planned like the Buddhist rock-cut *chaityas* at Nāsik, Ajanta etc., and (2) that it contains also an undoubtedly later and curious drainage arrangement made for the *liṅga* worship there, Longhurst declared that to begin with the building was a Buddhist *chaitya* in earlier age, but was converted to Śiva temple on the decline of Buddhism about the 7th or 8th century A.D.[84] And this thesis has been uniformly underlined by other scholars also.[85]

But the similarity, that the plan of the Kapōtēśvara temple complex bears to

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

that of the Pushpabhadrasvāmin (Śiva) temple complex (c. 3rd century A.D.) recently discovered at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, is really striking.[86] Similarly, on plan the Durgā temple at Aihole (c. 6th century A.D.) and the so-called Sahādēvaratha at Mahābalipuram (c. 7th century A.D.), perhaps meant to honour Indra, are apsidal like the above mentioned Buddhist *chaityas*.[87] All these seem to indicate that the forms of temples, in early days, were common to all the creeds.[88] Moreover even if it is proved that the *chaitya*-hall type is specifically Buddhist, what the Kapōtēśvara and Pushpabhadrasvāmin temples etc. can at best indicate is only that the same type was borrowed by the Hindu architects from the Buddhist architecture.[89] Again, it is totally forgotten by many that the word *chaitya* itself, even according to the Buddhists, is to be derived from the word *chitya* which specifically denotes the fire, worshipped.[90] The early works like the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* often mention *chaityas* and they obviously do not mean the Buddhist *chaityas*. Therefore there may be much truth when scholars say that *chaityas* were originally connected with the Vēdic sacrifices[91] and that the apsidal plan of the Buddhist *chaityas* was itself evolved from one or the other fire-altar of such sacrifices.[92] Above all, the discovery of the elliptical (*vṛittāyata*) temples of Vishṇu at Besnagar (Madhya Pradesh) and Nagarī (Rajasthan) assignable to the 3rd century B.C.[93] seem to suggest a necessary correction to the opinion usually held about the Buddhist *chaityas*. For, they show that it was the elliptical plan of the temples of the Hindu gods that was adopted by the Buddhist architecture to build temples in the form of apsidal shrines, like the *Buddha-chaityas* and the *stūpa-chāityas*.[94]

Coming to the question of the later addition of the water outlet to the sanctorum, it is to be remembered that originally the same was not usually built even in the monolithic and structural Hindu temples of the Pallavas and others. For, the forms of deities like Śiva, Sōmāskanda that were meant to be worshipped had been carved or painted on the back walls of the structure and they could not be bathed.[95] So, the present water outlet attached to the sanctorum of the Kapōtēśvara temple is to be assigned to a period when the worship of the painted form gave way to the bathing-oriented worship of the *liṅga* form as we find now in the temple.[95a] Again, if the temple was specifically Buddhist in form, it is doubtful whether a Hindu of ancient India could have readily appropriated it for the worship of the Hindu gods.[96] True, Yuan Chwang, who was actually staying in the Guntur region for sometime, speaks of the Buddhist monasteries of the area being deserted as we saw already. But there is no reference in his records to any Buddhist temple being appropriated by other sectarians. In the height of all, the Chezerla record, as we have seen already, seems to tell us that the temple of Kapōtēśvara was built perhaps under the name *Abhihita* for the said god himself by the *vānaprastha* Kapōta residing perhaps at Chēzerla on the date of the record.[97] Thus in the light of all these, the view usually held about the temple may require correction.

Regarding iconography of the age and area, we have already referred to the elephant-headed Vināyaka and to the iconographical features of the figure of Naṭarāja of the Mogalrājapuram cave-temple. The description of Sōmagirē(or rī)śvarānātha as three-eyed and as bearing the young moon on his matted hair seems to indicate some of the iconographical features of the deity—perhaps a painted one—worshipped

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

there. Similarly the description of Kapōtēśvara as Pārvatī-Paramēśvara and Achalēśvara and perhaps also as Gaṅgādhara and Śaśiśēkhara[98] may also indicate the iconographical features of the deity worshipped there. The Mogalrājapuram cave temple also contains tall *dvārapālas* with horns on their heads.[99] In the *kūḍus* of the said cave there are also representation of four headed Brahmā, Vishṇu and Śiva. While the last two are found with their respective female consorts, *viz.*, Lakshmī and Gaurī, it is conspicuous that there is no Sarasvatī with Brahmā.[100] One pillar of the same cave bears a medallion containing a figure of Vishṇu-Kṛishṇa with a recumbent elephant below, and the second pillar, a medallion with Kṛishṇa being suckled by a *rākshasī*.[101] They obviously represent respectively the killing of the elephant Kuvalayāpīḍa and that of the demon Pūtanā by Kṛishṇa.[102] Sri C. Sivaramamurti assigns to the pre-Chālukyan period, *i.e.*, the age of the Vishṇukuṇḍis, certain Vināyaka images at Mogalrājapuram, Biccavōlu (East Godavari District) and at Vijayavāḍa Museum and the beautiful sculptures of Madanāntaka (Śiva), of Brahmā and Vishṇu all found in Madugula (Guntur district).[103]

It is to be regretted that none of the paintings of the age has been preserved for our study. However we have already seen that the god Kapōtēśvara worshipped originally in the Chēzerla temple was perhaps a painted form of Umāmahēśvara. It is likely that the same was also the case with the god Sōmagirē (or-rī)śvarānātha of the Chikkulla plates.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. No. IV, line 7.
2. Appendix III.
3. See *e.g.* the *Īśāvāsyōpanishad, mantras* 9-11 and the commentaries thereunder.
4. For the unconvincing view that the Vishnukundis were Vaishnavas, see QJMS, XXV, p. 77 ; EHAC, p. 201.
5. *Ind. Arch.*, 1959-60, p. 77 and Plate LXV E
6. Ch. I, verses 271-94.
7. See No. VII, line 23 and note thereon.
8. See *Uttara.*, Kane's Introd. pp. 9, 19.
9. See EI, XXXVII, p. 284, text lines 7-8.
10. No. XVIII, line 41.
11. AR, ASI, S. Circle, 1916-17 pp. 34 ff.
12. Cf. *e.g.* the names Śatrumallēśvara, Lalitāṅkurapallavēśvara, Avanibhājanapallavēśvara etc., of the deities and temples mentioned in the inscription of Mahēndravarman I. See CTP, pp. 76, 79, 91.
13. No. VIII, lines 3, 28.
14. No. XVIII, line 22.
15. FNSI, p. 98.
16. CA, p. 395.
17. FNSI, pp. 98, 100.
18. Nos. VII, lines 13-14; IX, lines 18-19.
19. No. VIII, lines 4-5.
20. See ibid. lines 7-8. Cf. No. III, line 7; etc.
21. See No. I, lines 12, 21.
22. Ibid. line 12. See also AIU, p. 385; BD, p. 50; etc.
23. No. I, lines 14-16; BD, pp. 19 ff.
24. No. I, lines 17-18; CA, p. 377.
25. The *Vinayapiṭaka* belongs to the other sect.
26. No. I, lines 18 ff.
27. CA, pp. 375-76, 388.
28. BD, p. 11.
29. No. I, line 19.
30. See CA, p. 376.
31. No. XII, line 34.
32. EI, XX, pp. 22, 36.
33. JSI, pp. 15 17.
34. Ibid., pp. 4 ff.
35. See ARE, 1916-17, p. 116, where Krishna Sastri had brought home to the readers this doubt. However, the subsequent writers uniformly assert that the *vasati* was built by the said queen herself. See *e.g.* EECS, p. 2; CA, p. 253; JSI, p. 19.
36. Above Ch. III, sect. iii; Ch. V, sect. i, sect. iii; Ch. VI, sect. ii.
37. No. XI, lines 6-7; etc.
38. No. XVIII, line 29.
39. Nos. IV, lines 7-8; X, line 25; XVI, lines 21-23; XVII, lines 17-18.
40. Nos. X, line 22; XII, line 10; XIV, line 14; XVII, lines 15-16.
41. Nos. VI, line 8; X, line 24; etc.
42. Nos. IV, line 8; XIV, line 19.
43. CII, V, pp. 93 ff.
44. See the *Vēdānta-kalpataru* and the *Kalpataru-Parimala* under Br. S. III, iv, 20.
45. No. IX, line 27.
46. See Appendix III.
47. No. XIV, lines 14-15.
48. No. XV, lines 10-11.
49. Nos. IV, line 7; XVI, line 27.
50. EI, XXXIII, p. 293.
51. No. IV, lines 7-8.
52. See Keith's introd. to the *Aitarēyāraṇyaka*, p. 29.
53. See Ibid. KHD, II, ii, pp. 1246 ff.
54. See *e.g. Tai.* S. V, vi, 8.
55. IA, XIII, p. 138, text line 22.
56. The *padārthas* of the Nyāya system are classified as follows: *pramāṇa* (4), *pramēya* (12), *saṁśaya, prayōjana* and *dṛishṭānta* one each (3), *siddhānta* (4), *avayava* (5), *tarka, nirṇaya, vāda, jalpa* and *vitaṇḍā*, one each (5), *hētvābhāsa* (5), *chhala* (3), *jāti* and *nigrahasthāna*, two each (4). The sum total comes to 45. Similarly the six *padārthas* of the Vaiśēshikas as accepted by the *sūtrakāra* Kaṇāda are classified as: *dravya*(9),*guṇa*(17), *karma* (5), *sāmānya* (2). *viśēsha* (1, as a class) and *samavāya* (1). Thus the total comes to 35. The theories of seven *padārthas* and of 24 *guṇas* are later than the *sūtrakāra*.
57. See No. XVI, lines 24-26 and note thereon.
58. Cf. the expression *Shashṭi-tantra* (see the *Sāṅkhyakārikā*, verse 72) meaning 'the *śāstra* (dealing with the) sixty categories'.
59. Cf. *Mīmāṁsā-saṁjñakas=tarkaḥ* etc., quoted by Vāchaspatimiśra in his *Tātparyaṭīkā* under the *Nyāyasūtra*, I, i, 1.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

60. *I.e.*, The 25 *Sāṅkhya-tattvas*, together with *Iśvara* and the *Ashṭāṅga-yōga*.
61. No. XVI, lines 28-29.
61a. Cf. *e.g. Vētālaviṁśati*.
62. E.g. the *Taittirīyaśākhā*, consisting of 82 *prapāṭhakas* (divisions) is well known among the *vaidikas* as *Dvyaśīti* or *Aśīti-dvayam*. *Iśvarakṛishṇa* refers to his own Sāṅkhya treatise as *Saptati* as it consists of 70 verses. See the *Sāṅkhyakārikā*, verse 72. Of course the 12 chapters of the *Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā* together with Pāṇini's *Ashṭādhyāyī* make 20 chapters. But these two groups are not considered as a homogenious unit as the *Pūrva* and the *Uttara Mīmāṁsās* are.
63. The unpopularity of the Sāṅkhya system among the *vaidikas* was perhaps due to the vehement criticism of that system by Bādarāyaṇa etc. in Br. S.I, i, 5 ff.
64. No. IV, line 9.
65. See SED, s.v. *kalā*.
65a. See above Ch. VI, n. 84.
66. *The Pallavas*, p. 35; AHD, p. 92. On the basis of certain features that are common to these caves and to the caves of Mahēndravarman I, Dubreuil also opined that being a Vishṇukuṇḍi on his mother's side, the Pallava king might have learnt the art of cave temples from the Vishṇukuṇḍis. See *The Pallavas*, p. 35. The caves at Uṇḍavalli, Mogalrājapuram etc., have been already well described with plans and photographs and various theories have been suggested by scholars (See LPA, I, pp. 22 ff, plates VI ff; APGAS, No. 10, pp. 18 ff). Hence avoiding repetition of the same, let us concentrate here only on the conclusions arrived at by those scholars.
67. See *e g.* ED, pp. 560 ff; EECS, p. 24 etc; APGAS, No. 8, pp. 41; etc.
68. ARE, 1909, p. 74.
69. IA, V, p. 80; LPA, I, p. 22 ff; CA, p. 492.
70. LARPM, pp. 76 ff; ARMM, pp. 138; APGAS, No. 21, pp. 9 ff.
71. Even the latest writer, supporting vehemently the theory of the Chālukyan origin of these caves, is not unmindful of the facts that some of the caves have stylistic reflection of the Pallava rock-architectural meleau (See APGAS, No. 21, p. 13). It is also interesting to note that another writer attributed these caves to the Eastern Chālukyas first (JIH, XXXVIII, 1960, pp. 427. ff.) and then to the Vishṇukuṇḍis (APGAS, No. 10, 1963, pp. 18 ff.).
72. APGAS, No. 21, p. 10.
73. See Ch. VIII, sect. iii.
74. APGAS, No. 10, p. 28.
75. APGAS, No. 21, p. 10.
76. *Ind. Arch.* 1959-60, p. 84; APGAS, No. 21, p. 21.
77. ARE, 1959-60, Nos. B 65-67.
78. See also APGAS, No. 10, pp. 28 ff.
79. ARMM, pp. 132 ff., 192 ff.
80. See CTP, plates II, V, XIII. Hence there is truth when scholars say that in the Mogalrājapuram Naṭēśa we find a happy commingling of different schools. See EECS, pp. 17 ff.
81. CTP. plates XXI C, XXIII.
82. See H. Cousen, *The Chālukyan Architecture of the Kanarese Districts*, pp. 39-40 and plates.
83. For a detailed description and plan of this temple see ARASI, S. Circle, 1917-18. pp. 33 ff. and plates XVII, XVIII; APGAS, No. 21, pp. 15 ff. and plate.
84. See ARASI, S. Circle, 1917-18, p. 35.
85. See HIIA. p. 77; CA, pp. 204, 503; APGAS, No. 21, pp. 15 ff.
86. See APGAS, No. 21, plates I and II and figure 2.
87. LPA, II, p. 21, plate XI, a & b; HIIA, p. 78.
88. See *Ind. Arch.* 1959-60, p. 84; Benjamin Rowland, *The Art and Architecture of India*, p. 132.
89. Cf. LPA, II, p. 22.
90. Cf. *Chity-āgnichityē cha* (PA, III, i, 132) and also *Nāma.* II, ii, 7 and the respective commentaries thereon.
91. IA, XI, pp. 21 ff.
92. P.R. Srinivasan, *Beginnings of the Traditions of South Indian Temple Architecture*, p. 6.
93. *Ind. Arch.*, 1964-65, pp. 19 ff. and plate; *Lalit Kalā*, No. 13 (1967), pp. 21 ff. and plate.
94. *Lalit Kalā*, op. cit., pp. 25-26.
95. CTP, p. 35.
95a. See *e.g.* the curious water outlet in the Paṇamalai (S. Arcot. Dt.) Śiva temple built by Rājasiṁha.
96. The same may be applicable also to the temple at Ter. See HIIA, p. 77.
97. *I.e.*, as indicated by the present participle *adhivasataḥ* used as an adjective of Kapōta in the record (line 65). Cf. the present participles *adhitishṭhan* and *alaṅkurvāṇaḥ* used as adjectives of Pṛithivīyuvarāja in the same record (line 13).
98. See Ch. VIII, sect. iii; No. XVIII, lines 41, 59, 63-64.
99. For details see EECS, plate III.
100. For details see ibid. plate IV.
101. LPA, I, p. 26.
102. *Bhāga.*, X, Ch. 6 and 43
103. EECS, pp. 12-14, 22 and plates I, II, VII.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

INSCRIPTIONS

THE descriptions of all the following eighteen records are mostly based on the details furnished by the editors of the respective epigraphs. The characters of all the eighteen records belong to the Southern Class of alphabets, usually regular to the period and the region to which they belong (But cf. Ch. III sect. iv). The language of all these records is Sanskrit. The texts are written mainly in prose. Corrections to the texts are suggested wherever necessary either by means of round brackets in the text itself or by notes. As the contents of all these records have been adequately dealt with in the First Part itself and as the language of the texts is simple and clear, translation of the texts is not added. However, wherever necessary, notes are appended by way of elucidating individual words and passages. Almost all the verses in the records are in the *Anushṭubh* metre. Hence wherever other metres occur, they are generally indicated in notes in the respective places.

A—INSCRIPTIONS OF THE VISHṆUKUṆḌIS

No. I : TUMMALAGUDEM PLATES (SET I) OF GŌVINDAVARMAN I, YEAR 37

This charter, discovered in the village Tummalagudem (Ramanapeta Taluk, Nalgonda District, Andhra Pradesh), consists of five copper plates (each measuring about 26 cm by 5.5 cm) and a ring (about 7 cm in diameter and 1 cm in thickness) with a circular seal (3.5 cm in diameter) bearing the figure of a lion, as in the seal of the Chikkulla plates. Only the outer sides of the first and the fourth plates and both the sides of the fifth plate bear no writing. The whole set weighs about 981 gm. The following transcript is based on the facsimiles of the record published in EA, II, facing pp. 9ff.

TEXT

First Plate, Second Side[1]

1 [Siddham][2] Svasti [|*] Jitaṁ Bhagavatā tēna saṁbuddhēna kṛipātmanā [|*] nirvvāṇa-prāptayē yēna [sa]dbhyō mārggaḥ pradarśitaḥ[3] ||[1 *] Sa[t*]tva-satya-

2 [tyāg-ābhijana]-naya-vinay-ōtsāhādi-guṇa-gaṇa-saṁpadāṁ svayam-adhigata-rājyānāṁ samyak-prajāpālanāt=pra-

3 thit-āvadāta-pṛithu-yaśasāṁ rājñāṁ Vishṇukuṇḍīnām=amala-vipula-sakala-kula-tila-

4 kēna śrī-mahārāj-Ēndravarmma-satpautrēṇa mahārāja-śrī-Mādhavavarmmaṇaḥ suputrēṇa sva-ta(na)ya-

5 bhuja-bal-ōtsāha-prabhāv-ānurāg-āvāpta-sva-rājyēna śauryya-dhairyya-pratāp-ānubhāvād=a-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Second Plate, First Side

6 nya-sāmant-ākrānta-rājy-āntarēṇa[4] dāna-mān-ādibhir=anurakta-varṇāśrama-
svajana-parijanēna grāma-kshētra-

7 hiraṇya-dvirada-turaga-gō-balīvardda-śayan-āsana-yāna-pāna-bhōjana-bhājana-
bhavana-vasan-ābharaṇa-kanyā-

8 dāsī-dāsa-sahasrāṇāṁ dātrā anēka-dēvāyatana-vihāra-sabhā-prapā-taḍak-ōdu(da)-
pān-ā-

9 rāma-pratisaṁskār-āpūrvva-karaṇēn=ālaṁkṛita-sakala-digantarēṇa bhikshu-dvij-
ānātha-[yā]chaka-vyā-

10 dhita-dīna-kṛipaṇa-jan-ōpabhujyamāna-nyāy-ādhigata-vibhava-dhana-samudayēn-
āsak[ṛi]d=asakṛi[t=sva]-sarvva-

11 sva-tyāginā sakala-śāstr-ārttha-śravaṇa-parijñānād=ih=āparatra ch=ān-anya-
chakshushā[5] vidvach-chhūra-mah[ā]-

Second Plate, Second Side[6]

12 kulīna-jana-samāśrayēṇa sakala-sa[t*]tva-dhātu-trāṇāy=ōtpādita-Mahābōdhi-
chigte(ttē)na[7] mahārāja-śrī-

13 Gōvindavarmmaṇā ātmanaḥ pravarddhamāna-vijayarājya-saṁvatsarē sapta-
triṁśatkē[8] Vaiśākha-Pūrṇṇamāsyāṁ Bhaga-

14 vatō daśabala[9]-balinaḥ chātur-vvaiśāradya[10]-viśāradasy=[11]āshṭādaś-āvēṇika-
Buddha-dharmma-samāla[ṁ*]kṛi-

15 ta-mūrttēr=[12]dvātriṁśan-mahāpurusha-lakshaṇa-var-ōpalakshitasya [13]jāti-jarā-
maraṇa-śōk-ādishu bahu-

16 saṁsāra-duḥkha[14]-nimagna-sarvva-sa[t*]tv-ōttāraṇāy=[15]ānēka-kalp-āsaṁkhyēy-
ōpachita-puṇya-jñāna-saṁbhāra[16]-bhāra-[17]

17 sy=āpagata-rāga-dvēsha-mōha-ja[nana]-maraṇa-duḥkhasy=ā-pratihat-ān-āvara-
ṇa-sakala-jñēya-[jñā]nā-[18]

Third Plate, First Side

18 t=samyak-saṁbuddhasya Buddhasya mārggam=abhiprapannaṁ nirvviḍ-[19]
virāga-śīla[20]-śikshā-dhutaguṇ[21]-āddhyayana-śravaṇa-chi-

19 ntana-bhāvanā[22]-dhyāna[23]-samādhi[24]-samāpatty[25]-ādibhi[r*]=guṇa-ganair[26]=an-
uttaraṁ [27]puṇyakshētraṁ [28]triyāna-yāyinaṁ chāturddi-

20 śam=āryya-saṅgham=uddiśya tyāga-paribhōg-ānvayam=[29]aupadhikañ=cha
[30]puṇya-kriyā-vastv=abhinirvvartta-

21 yishyatā mātā-pitrōḥ sarvva-sa[t*]tvānāñ=cha nikhila-dāridyē(drya)-[31]duḥkh-
ōpaśama-hētōḥ svasyā agra-

22 mahishyā[ḥ] Paramamahādēvyā vihārasya dīpa-dhūpa-gandha-pushpa-dhvaja-
pāna-bhōjana-śayan-āsana-glāna-[32]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

23 bhaishajya-khaṇḍasphuṭita-śīrṇṇa-saṁskār-ādi-kuśala-mūl-ān-upachchhēd-ārttha[ṁ] dvāv=Ērmad[ā]la-Prēṇkapaṛu-

Third Plate, Second Side[33]

24 nāmadhēy[au] grāmau udaka-dāna-pūrvvakam=atisṛishṭau sanidhi-s-ōpanidhi-sadaṇḍa-kara-[34]vishṭi-s[v]-ōchchhishṭa-bhāga-

25 bhōga-pradēyāv=a-chāra[35]-bhaṭa-dūta-vallabha-rājapurushair=a-pravēśyau vi-mukta-sakala-parihārau Vishṇukuṇḍi-

26 [36]kula-vaṁśyai rājabhis=saṁrakshaṇīyau saṁvarddhanīyau cha [1*] [37]Sthitir=ēshā sthāpitā [1*] sthity-atikramē pañcha-

27 mahāpātaka-yōgaḥ pravṛitta-puṇya-kriyā-vichchhēdē ch=ānanta-duḥkha-bhū-yishṭhē narakē tiryya-

28 k-prēta-gatishv=anishṭa-karmma-phal-ōpabhōgam=anubhavati || bhavanti ch=ātra Manu-gitā[ḥ*] ślōkā[ḥ*] ||

29 Shashṭiṁ varsha-sahasrāṇi svarggē vasati bhūmidaḥ [1*] āchchhēttā ch=ānu-mantā cha tāny=ēva narakē vasēt || [2*]

Fourth Plate, First Side

30 Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā yō harēta vasundharām [1*] sa vishṭhāyāṁ krimir=bhūtvā pitṛibhi[s]=saha pachyatē || [3*]

31 Bahubhir=vvasudhā dattā bahubhiś=ch=ānupālitā [1*] yasya yasya yadā bhūmis=tasya tasya ta[dā]

32 phalam || [4*] Bhūvi Mēr-ūdadhī yāvad=div=īndu-ravi-mārutā[ḥ1*] tāvach=chhrī-Vishṇukuṇḍīnāṁ pṛithivī[ṁ] śāstu śāsanam || [5*]

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. This side bears the number *1* in the margin, against line 3.
2. Expressed by a spiral-like symbol.
3. The metre of this and all the other verses in this record is *Anushṭubh*.
4. Better read *ākrānt-ānya-sāmanta-rājy-āntarēṇa dāna-mān-ādibhir=anurañjita-varṇ-āśrama* etc.
5. Cf. *chakshushmattā tu śāstrēṇa sūkshma-kāry-ārtha-darśinā* (*Raghu.*, IV, verse 13).
6. This side is numbered as *2* in the margin against line 14.
7. *Bōdhi-chitt-ōtpāda* is the mental disposition of one whose chief aim is enlightenment. This is one of the three *kuśala-mūlas* or roots of virtues, the other two being *āśaya-viśuddhi* and *ahaṁkāra-mamakāra-parityāga*. See *Dharma.*, p. 4, sect. XV. See also Ch. X, sect. i (2).
8. Cf. *saptā-viṁśatikam*, No. VI, line 16.
9. For a list of the *daśa-balas* or the ten-fold forces of a *tathāgata*, like *sthān-āsthāna-jñāna-balam* 'the force of knowing possibilities and impossibilities', see *Dharma.*, p. 16, sect. LXXVI. See also Ch. X, sect i (2).
10. For the four *vaiśāradyas* (Pāli *vesārajja*), like *abhisambōdhi* 'perfect enlightenment' etc. see *Dharma.*, p. 16, sect. LXXVII, and 9. See also Ch. X, sect. i (2).
11. The *Dharma.* also enumerates (p. 17, sect. LXXIX) the eighteen *āvēṇika-dharmas* or special characteristics of the enlightened. They are *askhalitam* 'firmness' etc.
12. For a list of thirty-two *mahāpurusha-laksha-*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

ṇas or the characteristic signs of great man, such as having the palms of hands and feet with marks of wheel, see ibid. p. 18, sect. LXXXIII., above Ch. X. sect. i (2).

13. Cf. *Jātir=jarā maraṇaṁ Śōka-paridēva-duḥkha-daurmanasy-ōpāyāḥ* (*Dharma.*, p. 9., sect. XLII.)
14. Read correctly *duḥkhēshu nimagna-*
15. Cf. *Ayaṁ Bhagavān=aparimita-kālābhyāsāt =sātmībhūt-ōpachita-puṇya-karmā* (*Jātaka*, p. 6).
16. The *puṇya* (merit) and *jñāna* (wisdom) are the two *sambhāras* or equipments to attain freedom from misery. See *Dharma.*, p. 29, sect. CXVII.
17. After this letter, probably *cha* originally written seems to have been erased.
18. The two *āvaraṇas* or faults of knowledge are *klēśa-jñēy-āvaraṇas*. See *Dharma.*, p. 28, sect. CXV.
19. Probably *nirdviḍ-virāga-* is the intended reading.
20. For three kinds of *śīlas* or moral principles viz., *Sambhāra-Kuśalasaṅgrāha-Sattvārthakriyā-Śīlas*, and for the three-fold *Śikshās* or disciplines viz., *adhichitt-ādhiśīl-ādhiprajñā-Śikshās*, see *Dharma.*, p. 27, sect. CVI; and p. 33, sect. CXL.
21. For the twelve-fold *dhuta-guṇas* (also spelt as *dhūta*⁰) or qualities of the purified man, see ibid. p. 13. sect. LXIII, and commentaries on the *Dhammapada* (PTS), Vol. IV, p. 30.
22. For the three-fold *bhāvanās* or application of the Buddhist teaching, viz., *kāya-chitta-prajñā-bhāvanās*, see the *Dīghanikāya*, Vol. III, p. 219.
23. The *Dharma.* enumerates (p. 15, sect. LXXII; p. 28, sect. CIX) the four stages and three kinds of *dhyāna* or meditation.
24. *Samādhi* means the intense self-contemplation. For details of four-fold division of it, see ibid., p. 23, sect. CI; p. 32, sect. CXXXVI; Childers, *Dict. of the Pali Language*, s.v.
25. *Samāpatti* means the attainment (of all the stages of the *samādhi*). The PED enumerates eight and nine *samāpattis*.
26. Here the Instrumental *gaṇaiḥ* is *hētau or saha-yōgē tṛitīyā*.
27. In the Budddist works the expression *anuttaram puṇyakshētram* 'unsurpassed field of merit' is often used as an epithet of the *Saṅgha*, because of the belief that anything sown on (*i.e.*, given to) it is reaped back in abundance by the benefactor.
28. The three *yānas* or vehicles intended are the *Śrāvaka-Pratyēkabuddha-Mahāyānas*. See *Dharma.*, p. 1, sect. II; the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (Trans. by Kern, SBE, XXI), pp. 34-35. See above Ch. X, sect. i (2).
29. As in the Bud. hist works, here too *aupadhika* means 'material things'. Cf. *e.g. Pañchabhiḥ kāraṇaiḥ Buddhā Bhagavanta upadhau tishṭhanti;* etc. *Divyāvadāna*, p. 542. The Pāli equivalent of the word is *opadhika* and it is taken to mean 'forming a substratum for re-birth (with reference to *puñña* or merit)'. See PED. s.v.
30. Though the *puṇyakriyā-vastu* (*i.e.*, a token or object of meritorious action) is usually stated to be of three kinds, viz., *Dāna-Śīla-Bhāvanā-maya- puṇyas*, by authorities like the *Dīghanikāya* (Vol. III, p. 288, sect. XXXVIII), the *Mahāvyutpatti* (Sakaki Ed. 1916, entries 1699-1704) adds *aupadhika* and *guṇya* also to the above list. Our record probably follows the school represented by the latter authority.
31. Cf. *upadravāś=cha praśamaṁ nītā dāridrya-duḥkhāni cha śīlē pratishṭhāpītānām* in the *Jātaka*. (p. 72).
32. Cf. *Chīvara-piṇḍapāta-śayanāsana-glānapratyaya-bhaishajyārtham* (EI, XVII, p. 322, text line 39).
33. The number *3* is engraved in the margin of this side of the plate against line 26.
34. Originally *vvi* was engraved.
35. The usual form is *a-chāṭa-*
36. Cf. the Pāli *kula-vaṁsa* 'lineage', 'progeny'.
37. See above Ch. III, sect. iv.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

No. II : VELPURU PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF MĀDHAVAVARMAN II, YEAR 33

This inscription is engraved on the northern and the western faces (A&B) of the lower part of a white marble stone pillar, the extant part measuring about 2.75m. in height, now set up in the front *maṇḍapa* of the Rāmaliṅgēśvara temple in Vēlpūru (Sattannapalle Taluk, Guntur District, A.P.). None of the lines of the epigraph is fully preserved and hence the record is very fragmentary. Above the engraving there are carved figures of two lions one behind the other, both facing proper right and resting on their fore legs and having the hindpart of their bodies raised. Similar figures are found on the top of one of the Ghantasala inscriptions of about the 3rd century A.D. (EI, XXVII, plate facing p. 2, Inscr. A). The following transcript is based on the plate published in EI, XXXVII, between pp. 128-29.

TEXT

Face A

1 Diṭṭham[1] || Svasti [||*] Bha[2].....mipād[3]-ānudhyāta-Vishṇukuṇḍi-

2 [gō]trōtprabhavasya[4] Gōvi....[5][s]ūnōr=Mmādhavavarma[ṇō] rājya-pravarddha-

3 māna-tryastriṁśat-saṁvatsarē Tai....[6]la-vikramēṇa Mādhavavarmmaṇā

4 [i]ha skandhāvāra-gatō Vēlpūru-[dē][7]śam(śaṁ) śāsan [a]nēka-samara-[mukh-ā]...[8]

5 vijaya-śrīmān=gō-sahas[ra]-p[ra]dā[y]ī.....

6 [na]t-ātula-[Pa]llava-kula.....

7 .....ku[ṇḍ]yadhi[9].....gandha[10]-[ga].....

8 .....rutō [śā]. tō[11].....

9 .....grāmē.....

10 .....gatavān [l*] a[tr=ai[12]]va ānaka-[sthā]pan[ā]dika.....

11 .....śva[r]ya.....

12 .....

Face B

13 .....nt[i]mukha[13]-svāminaḥ pratimām=ānīyya(ya)

14 .....śata.....[14] [ra]ṇyaṁ da[t*]tvā mahatā prayatnēna pūjā[ṁ]

15 .....[15]vaṁ vijayēn=n=ān ṛitaṁ(tam) [l*] Sthāpita[ñ=chal nṛipasy=ā [.][16]

16 .....[l*] Vināyakaṁ namasyanti narā.....[17][||*]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. This word is usually taken to be a Prākṛitic equivalent of the Skt. *dṛishṭam*, 'seen'. See EI, I, pp. 9-10; EHD, p. 196. Also see EI, III, p. 259; VI, p. 88; IX, p. 268.
2. The seven letters which are lost here may be restored as *-gavach-Chhrīparvvatasvā-*
3. The letter *pā* has an unnecessary *ū-mātrā*.
4. Read *gōtrāt=prabhavasya* or *gōtr-ōdbhavasya*.
5. The four letters that are lost here obviously *ndavarmmaṇaḥ*. Only the *ū-mātrā* of the following *sū* is visible.
6. The broken portion seems to have consisted of only three letters which might have been originally *shyām=atu*.
7. Only the proper right part of the letter *dē* is visible. It is likely that the intended reading is *dēśam*.
8. The two *aksharas* that are lost here are obviously *vāpta*.
9. These doubtful letters suggest here an expression like *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja* as found in No. V, line 13.
10. Originally *dta* was engraved. This partly available expression here reminds us of the epithet *nṛipati-gandhagaja* of the Western Chālukya Kīrttivarman I in the Aihole inscription. (EI, VI p. 5, verse 10).
11. The intended reading is probably *mārutaḥ śāsitō*.
12. The reading of *trai* is doubtful.
13. *Dantimukha* is intended here since Vināyaka is mentioned in line 16.
14. Here *śata-sahasraṁ hiraṇyaṁ* seem to be the intended expression.
15. The intended reading is perhaps *°ēvaṁ vijayēn=n=ānṛitaṁ*. This is perhaps intended to be a *phala-śruti*. Here we have a rare *parasmaipada* form of the root *ji* following the preposition *vi*. Cf. *Viparābhyāṁ jēḥ* (PA,I, iii, 19).
16. The intended expression here seems to be *°sy=ājñā* or *°sy=ārthē*.
17. *Sthāpitañ=cha* etc. may be a verse in *Anushṭubh* metre.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

No. III : IPUR PLATES (SET I) OF MĀDHAVAVARMAN II, YEAR 37

This charter, found in the village Ipūr (Tenali Taluk, Guntur District, A.P.) consists of a set of three copper plates (each measuring about 16.5 cm by 3.8 cm) and a copper ring (about 7 cm in diameter) with a somewhat worn out circular seal (2.75 cm in diameter), divided into two sections by a horizontal line in the middle. Above the line is found a symbol, already described,[1] with a lamp on either side and with the representations probably of the Sun and the Moon above, all cut in relief. Below the line is the legend (1) *Śrī-Mādhava-* (2) *varmmā*, in two lines. The whole set of the charter weighs about 30 *tolas*. The following transcript is based on the plate of the record published in EI, XVII, facing p.334.

TEXT

First Plate, Second Side

1 Svasti ।[2] Bhagavach-Chhrīparvvatasvāmi-pādānuddhyātasya Vishṇukuṇḍīnām =aparimita-bala-parākramasya

2 paramadhārmmikasya praṇata-sakala-sāmantasy=ānēka-gō-hiraṇya-bhūmi-pra dānasya mahārājasya

3 śri(śrī)-Gōvindavarmmaṇaḥ putraḥ smṛiti[3]mati-bala-sa[t*]tva-dhairyya-vīryya-vinaya-saṁpannaḥ

4 [4]sakala-mahi(hī)maṇ[ḍ]ala-ma[n]ujapati-[p]ratipūjita-śāsanaḥ Trivaranagara-bhavana-gata-yuva-

Second Plate: First Side

5 ti hṛidaya-nandanaḥ sva-naya-bala[5]-vijita-sakala-sāmant-ātula[6]-bala-vinaya-nayaniya-

6 ma-sa[t*]tva-sa[ṁ]pannaḥ sakala-jagad-avanipati-pratipūjita-śāsanaḥ Agnishṭō-masahasra-yā-

7 jī Hi[ra*]ṇyagarbbha-prasūtaḥ ēkādaś-Āśvamēdh-āvabhṛitha-vidhūta-jagat-kalmashaḥ[7] susti(sthi)ra-

8 karmmā mahārāja-śrī-Mādhavavarmmā vijayaskandhāvārā[t*][8] Kuḍāvāḍa-vāsakē[9] Guddādi-visha-

Second Plate, Second Side

9 yē Vilēmbali-grāma-janān=sarvvān=ēvama(m=ā)jñāpayati yathā [।*] asmai Vatsa-gōtrāya brāhmaṇā-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

10 ya Aṁ(A)[10]gniśarmmaṇē asmad-vaṁśa-vibhūtyarttham(rtthaṁ)[11] sarvva-parihārēṇa dattavān=asmi [l*] tad=avagamya sarvva-

11 rājapurushaiḥ pariharttavyaḥ pālayitavyaś=cha [l*] asy=ājñā priyaputraḥ Mañchyaṇṇabhaṭṭārakaḥ [l*]

Third Plate, First Side

12 Bahubhir=vvasudhā dattā bahubhiś=ch=ānupālitā [l*] yasya yasya yadā bhūmis=tasya tasya tadā pha-

13 la[m ‖ 1*] Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā yō harēta vasundharām [l*] ākshēptā ch=ānumantā cha sarvvathā naraka[ṁ*] vrajēt [ll 2*]

14 Pravarddhamāna-vijayarājya-saṁvatsarē saptā(pta)-tri[ṁ]śē Gi pa[12] 7 di[13] 10 5 lll

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. See above Ch. II, sect. ii.
2. The word *svasti* and the punctuation mark are engraved in the left margin in between lines 1 and 2.
3. Hultzsch translates *smṛiti* as "(*knowledge of*) law." However cf. *Smṛītimān pratibhānavān* in the description of Rāma by Vālmīki (*Rāma.* II, i. 22) and the commentaries thereunder.
4. Cf. *aśēsha-narapati-samabhyarchchita-śāsanaḥ*, an epithet of the king Śūdraka in *Kāda.* (p. 7).
5. Hultzsch corrects *naya-bala* into *bhujabala* " power of arms". But cf. *sva-naya-bhujabala* in No., I, lines 4-5.
6. Better read *-sāmantō=tula-*
7. Bathing in the *avabhṛitha* of the horse-sacrifice is believed to purify persons of all their sins. Cf. a parallel epithet of Mādhavavarman IV (No. X, lines 12-13); and *Bhūs=cha yēna Hayamēdha-yājinā prāpitāvabhṛitha majjanā babhau*, a description of Pulakēśi I in the Aihole inscription (EI, VI, p. 4, verse 8).
8. The omission of *t* may be due to the Prākṛit influence. Cf. *Kāñchīpurā* and *Vēṅgīpurā* respectively of the Pallava and the Sālaṅkāyana charters.
9. Hultzsch reads *vasāka-Gu(kād=Gu)ddādi.*
10. The *anusvāra* is evidently due to the influence of the Prākṛit word *aṁgi*=Skt. *agni.*
11. After this, an expression like *imaṁ grāmaṁ* is understood.
12. *Gi pa* is a contraction of the Prākṛitic *Giṁha-pakhē*=Skt. *Grīshma-pakshē.*
13. *Di* is a contraction of *dinē.*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

No. IV : KHANAPUR PLATES OF THE TIME OF MĀDHAVAVARMAN II

This charter, found at Khānāpur (Khanapur Taluk, Satara District, Maharashtra) is fragmentary, containing probably the second and the third plates of a set which might have originally consisted of three plates (each measuring about 25 cm by 13.5 cm) the first plate being missing, and even the second plate being broken away irregularly resulting in the loss of portions both at its top and bottom. The ring and the seal are also lost. The weight of the extant set is not known. The following transcript is based on the plate of the record published in EI, XXVII, between pp. 316-17.

TEXT

Second Plate, First Side

1 .....[pa]...[sthita].....ba[h]u.....

2 vā[p]tayē[1] bahubhir=yyajñ-[ā]vabhri(bhṛi)thē snātvā bhūyaś=chaka-Puṇḍarika[2]-Bahusu-

3 varṇē(rṇ-ai)kādaśa[3]-yājinaḥ [4]sārvabhaumasya bhās[ā] bhāskarasya aiśva-

4 ryyēṇa svayam=Indrasya chāturvvarṇṇa(rṇṇya)-chāturāśramya-dharmma-karmm-sētōr[5]=mmahā-

5 rāja-śrī-Mādhavavarmmaṇō matir=utpannā pātrabhūtābhyā[ṁ] Brāhma-

6 ṇa-pravarābhyāṁ yajana-yājan-ādhyayan-ādhyāpana-dāna-pratigrahāya

7 [6]śruti-smri(smṛi)ti-vihita-sanātana-dharmma-karmma-niratāya [7]dviv[ē]da-gṛihi-(hī)ta-Sahasra[8]-Śālla(la)[ṁ]kāyana-

8 [sa]gōtra-[Ch*]chhandōga-Bālasvāmin[ē*] Ta(Bhā)radvāja-sagōtra-dvivēdē-(da)-paṇḍa(ṇḍi)ta-ti..

9 ...Kēśavasvāminē cha chatu[ḥ*]shashṭi-sā(śā)s[tr]ē saṁ[9]-

10 ..[datta]-chaturguṇa-bhāga.....kañ=ch=ābhyaḥ[10] Brā..ṇa-[11].....[12]

Second Plate, Second Side

11 ...dāna-prabhṛiti-sarvva.....

12 ..bhōgē yōjanād=dakshiṇataḥ pūrvvōttarēṇa Machha[va]ryyā Da..-

13 varyyā Sēṇavaryyā pūrvvadakshiṇa[13]-bhāgē Kōlikā nāma grāmaḥ paśchi[mē]-

14 na Malakhēṭakē nāma grāmaṇa(ē)tēshu madhyē shaṭkarmma[14]-hai(hē)tuka-yajñādya-sva-

15 [rggā]pavarga-si[d*]dhyarṭha[ṁ] vāṭikābhiḥ sahitaṁ nirddiśyatē Kṛishṇa-Bēṇṇā-pūrvva-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

16 dakshiṇataḥ Rēṭṭūrakaṁ nāma grāma[ḥ] । Vaṁkatīrthaṁ tathā Ta[m]batī-

17 rthaṁ Kadaṁ- batīrthaṁ Bēlavāṭikā Kōlikāvāṭikā Vaṭṭarikā sarvv-ādāna-viśuddham= ētābhir=vvāṭi-

18 kai(kā)[bhiḥ*] saṁyuktaṁ Mahāvaiśākhyāṁ[15] Paurṇamāsyām=ahni tribhāga- śēsh[ō](shaṁ) vidhivad=udaka-

19 pūrvvaṁ Rēṭṭūrakaṁ dattam=iti[16] ॥ Kalpa-sahasra-saṅkhyātō bhaṭṭagrāmaḥ[17] udakī ....

20 .....[da*]ttaḥ .....tāraṁ[18]

21 .....

Third Plate, First side

22 vāpyatē=parā mṛidhi[19] tathā dharmmakōśa-vṛi[d*]dhi[ḥ*][20] vipulaścha(lañ= cha) yaśaḥ paridhāvati[21] । Bahu-

23 bhir=vvasudhā bhuktā rājanaiḥ(bhiḥ) Sagarādibhiḥ [।*] yasya yasya yadā bhūmis=ta-

24 sya tasya tadā phalaṁ(lam) [॥1*] Sva-dattāṁ para-dattā[ṁ] vā yō harēta vasu[ṁ]dharāṁ(rām) [।*] shashṭi-

25 kalpa-sahasrāṇi vishṭhāyāṁ jāyatē krimiḥ [॥ 2*] Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā yō

26 bhu(bhū)miṁ parirakshati [।*] shashṭi-kalpasahasra(srā)ṇi svargga-lōkē pramō-

27 dati[22] [॥ 3*] Shashṭi-varsha-sahasrāṇi svarggē tishṭa(shṭha)ti bhu(bhū)- midaḥ [।*] ā-

28 chhē(chchhē)ttā ch=ānumaṁtā chā(cha) tāny=ēva narakē vasēta[23] [॥ 4*] Pūrvva-dattāṁ dvijātibhyō yatnā-

29 d=raksha dyu(Yu)dhishṭhira [।*] mahi(hī)m=mahimatāṁ chhrēshṭha[24] danā[ch]=chh[r*] ēyō=nupālanaṁ(nam)[॥ 5*] Tasmā-

30 t=sarvva-prayatnēna pūrvva-dattāṁ vasundharāṁ(rām)[।*] krichhrē=pi pālayēd=rājā pātaki(kī) syā-

31 [n*]=na pālayana[25] [॥ 6*] [26]Kāyasthēna Śrīpālēna[27] likhitam=iti satya-dha- rmma-saṁsthitēna śraddha(ddh-ā)nvitēna [॥*]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Prof. Mirashi reads *va(sa)yē(yō)* (EI, XXVII, p. 316).
2. Probably *ch=aikādaśa-Pauṇḍarīka* is intended, as in No. IX, line 5.
3. It has been read as *Bahusuvarṇakadaśa-yājinaḥ* and the intended reading is believed to be *Bahusuvarṇaka-Shōḍaśi-yājinaḥ* (EI, XXVII, p. 316, n. 8). It is also held that the reading is *bhūyaśchakē* (*krē*) *Puṇḍari* (*ka-Bahusuvaṇai* (*rṇai*)*kādaśa* and that the eleven sacrifices, supposed to be not mentioned, are *Aśvamēdhas* (Ibid. pp. 314-15). See above n. 2.
4. Though *sārvabhauma* lit. means 'the ruler of all land (*i.e.*, the whole earth)', it is often found used actually to indicate 'a paramount independent ruler of a territory'. See SG, p. 4.
5. Cf. *sētuḥ satyasya*, in the description of Śukanāsa in *Kāda*. (p. 127), and *dharma-sētusa* an adjective of a Buddhist cave in Nasik inscription (EI. VIII, p. 60, line 11). In all these places *sētu* signifies one that supports or maintains something. Cf. *sētu-śabdārthō=pi vidhāraṇatva-mātram=ēva* in Śaṅkara's commentary on *Br. S.*, (I, iii, 1) and the passage *rāj=āyaṁ dharmasya sētuḥ* in the *Kalpataru-Parimala* thereunder.
6. The letters in lines 7-10 are small in characters and are very much cramped.
7. Better read *dvivēdāya* + + + *sahasrāya* + + + + *gōtrāya Chhandōgāya*. Mirashi reads *dvivēdō*(*dā*)-*ha*(*ra*)*ṇalatāti* and remarks that this and three expressions further on in lines 9 and 10 are unintelligible.
8. See above Ch. X, sect. ii.
9. As the letters are very much cramped the engraver had been compelled to stop this line here. The expression *chatuḥshashṭi* denotes the sixty-four arts.
10. Taking into consideration the passage *tri-bhāgaśēshaṁ* + + + + *Rēṭṭūrakaṁ dattam* in lines 18-19 below, one may tentatively restore this mutilated passage as *[pūrvva]-sampradatta-chatur-guṇa-bhāga-rahitaṁ Rēṭṭūrakañ=cha*. Here *guṇa* and *bhāga* are probably synonyms. See PA, V, ii, 47 and commentaries thereunder.
11. Obviously *ñ=ch=ābhyāṁ Brāhmaṇābhyāṁ* is intended. Cf. EI, XXVII, p. 317 and n. 7.
12. Probably we have to think that here we have lost about 10 letters consisting of some expression, like *dātavyam=iti atō=smābhiḥ*, an expression that may be in tune with *matir=utpannā* (line 5 above) and *nirddiśyatē* and *dattam* (lines 15 and 19). Similarly in the next line also the mutilated passage may be restored as *kara-dāna-prabhṛiti-sarva-bādhā-varjam etc.*
13. *Ṇa*, originally omitted, is engraved in small characters above the line.
14. For the *shaṭ-karmas* or the six-fold duties see line 6 above.
15. *Mahā-Vaiśākhī* denotes the full-moon day of the month Vaiśākha, with Sunday, Viśākhā-nakshatra and the *Varīya-yōga* while the Sun is in Mēsha, Jupiter in Dhanus, Mars in Makara and Saturn in Tulā. See *An Indian Ephemeris*, Vol. I, pt. i, p 60.
16. The word *iti* appears to suggest that the original earlier part of the introductory portion which is lost now, most probably contained a declaration like *Rēṭṭūraka-nivāsinaḥ sarvān=ēvam=ājñāpayati yathā* etc., by someone (*i.e.*, a king) referring to the desire of Mādhavavarman (line 5).
17. *Bhaṭṭagrāma* 'a village granted to the learned Brāhmaṇas'.
18. Evidently *āchandr-ārka-tāraṁ* is intended.
19. Read *vṛiddhiḥ*.
20. Cf. *mātā-pitrōr=mahādharma-ratna-kōśa-samṛiddhayē* (EI, XXXVII, p. 55, verse 5)
21. This passage indicates that an expression like *ētad-dharma-rakshā-kartuḥ* of this sentence is obviously lost in the previous line.
22. Note the epic *Parasmaipada* form *mōdati*.
23. Read *vasēt*.
24. Read °*tāñ=chhrēshṭha* or °*tāṁ śrēshṭha*.
25. Read *kṛichchhrē=pi* + + + + *pālayan*.
26. As in a Kushāṇa inscription (EI, XXXVII, p. 152, text line 3, p. 153 n.) and as in some of the epigraphs dated in the Gupta era (EI, XV, pp. 130ff; IHQ, VI, p. 53ff.), here too *kāyastha* may mean 'a writer'. (See EI, XXVII, p, 314, f. n. 1). Some, however, would take the word as a caste-name. See ibid. p. 314.
27. This name can be read as *Śrī-Vā*(*Bā*)*lēna* also.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

16 dakshiṇataḥ Rēṭṭūrakaṁ nāma grāma[ḥ] | Vaṁkatīrthaṁ tathā Ta[m]batī-rthaṁ Kadaṁ-

17 batīrthaṁ Bēlavāṭikā Kōlikāvāṭikā Vaṭṭarikā sarvv-ādāna-viśuddham=ētābhir=vvāṭi-

18 kai(kā)[bhiḥ*] saṁyuktaṁ Mahāvaiśākhyāṁ[15] Paurṇamāsyām=ahni tribhāga-śēsh[ō](shaṁ) vidhivad=udaka-

19 pūrvvaṁ Rēṭṭūrakaṁ dattam=iti[16] || Kalpa-sahasra-saṅkhyātō bhaṭṭagrāmaḥ[17] udakī ....

20 .....[da*]ttaḥ .....tāraṁ[18]

21 .....

Third Plate, First side

22 vāpyatē=parā mṛidhi[19] tathā dharmmakōśa-vṛi[d*]dhi[ḥ*][20] vipulaścha(laṅ=cha) yaśaḥ paridhāvati[21] | Bahu-

23 bhir=vvasudhā bhuktā rājanaiḥ(bhiḥ) Sagarādibhiḥ [|*] yasya yasya yadā bhūmis=ta-

24 sya tasya tadā phalaṁ(lam) [||1*] Sva-dattāṁ para-dattā[ṁ] vā yō harēta vasu[ṁ]dharāṁ(rām) [|*] shashṭi-

25 kalpa-sahasrāṇi vishṭhāyāṁ jāyatē krimiḥ [|| 2*] Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā yō

26 bhu(bhū)miṁ parirakshati [|*] shashṭi-kalpasahasra(srā)ṇi svargga-lōkē pramō-

27 dati[22] [|| 3*] Shashṭi-varsha-sahasrāṇi svarggē tishṭa(shṭha)ti bhu(bhū)-midaḥ [|*] ā-

28 chhē(chchhē)ttā ch=ānumaṁtā chā(cha) tāny=ēva narakē vasēta[23] [|| 4*] Pūrvva-dattāṁ dvijātibhyō yatnā-

29 d=raksha dyu(Yu)dhishṭhira [|*] mahi(hī)m=mahimatāṁ chhrēshṭha[24] danā[ch]=chh[r*] ēyō=nupālanaṁ(nam)[|| 5*] Tasmā-

30 t=sarvva-prayatnēna pūrvva-dattāṁ vasundharāṁ(rām)[|*] krichhrē=pi pālayēd=rājā pātaki(kī) syā-

31 [n*]=na pālayana[25] [|| 6*] [26]Kāyasthēna Śrīpālēna[27] likhitam=iti satya-dharmma-saṁsthitēna śraddha(ddh-ā)nvitēna [||*]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Prof. Mirashi reads *va(sa)yē(yō)* (EI, XXVII, p. 316).
2. Probably *ch=aikādaśa-Pauṇḍarīka* is intended, as in No. IX, line 5.
3. It has been read as *Bahusuvarṇakadaśa-yājinaḥ* and the intended reading is believed to be *Bahusuvarṇaka-Shōḍaśi-yājinaḥ* (EI, XXVII, p. 316, n. 8). It is also held that the reading is *bhūyaśchakē* (*krē*) *Puṇḍari* (*ka-Bahusuvaṇai* (*rṇai*)*kādaśa* and that the eleven sacrifices, supposed to be not mentioned, are *Aśvamēdhas* (Ibid. pp. 314-15). See above n. 2.
4. Though *sārvabhauma* lit. means 'the ruler of all land (*i.e.*, the whole earth)', it is often found used actually to indicate 'a paramount independent ruler of a territory'. See SG, p. 4.
5. Cf. *sētuḥ satyasya*, in the description of Śukanāsa in *Kāda*. (p. 127), and *dharma-sētusa* an adjective of a Buddhist cave in Nasik inscription (EI. VIII, p. 60, line 11). In all these places *sētu* signifies one that supports or maintains something. Cf. *sētu-śabdārthō=pi vidhāraṇatva-mātram=ēva* in Śaṅkara's commentary on *Br. S.*, (I, iii, 1) and the passage *rāj=āyaṁ dharmasya sētuḥ* in the *Kalpataru-Parimala* thereunder.
6. The letters in lines 7-10 are small in characters and are very much cramped.
7. Better read *dvivēdāya* + + + *sahasrāya* + + + + *gōtrāya Chhandōgāya*. Mirashi reads *dvivēdō*(*dā*)-*ha*(*ra*)*ṇalatāti* and remarks that this and three expressions further on in lines 9 and 10 are unintelligible.
8. See above Ch. X, sect. ii.
9. As the letters are very much cramped the engraver had been compelled to stop this line here. The expression *chatuḥshashṭi* denotes the sixty-four arts.
10. Taking into consideration the passage *tri-bhāgaśēshaṁ* + + + + *Rēṭṭūrakaṁ dattam* in lines 18-19 below, one may tentatively restore this mutilated passage as *[pūrvva]-sampradatta-chatur-guṇa-bhāga-rahitaṁ Rēṭṭūrakañ=cha*. Here *guṇa* and *bhāga* are probably synonyms. See PA, V, ii, 47 and commentaries thereunder.
11. Obviously *ñ=ch=ābhyāṁ Brāhmaṇābhyāṁ* is intended. Cf. EI, XXVII, p. 317 and n. 7.
12. Probably we have to think that here we have lost about 10 letters consisting of some expression, like *dātavyam=iti atō=smābhiḥ*, an expression that may be in tune with *matir=utpannā* (line 5 above) and *nirddiśyatē* and *dattam* (lines 15 and 19). Similarly in the next line also the mutilated passage may be restored as *kara-dāna-prabhṛiti-sarva-bādhā-varjam etc.*
13. *Ṇa*, originally omitted, is engraved in small characters above the line.
14. For the *shaṭ-karmas* or the six-fold duties see line 6 above.
15. *Mahā-Vaiśākhī* denotes the full-moon day of the month Vaiśākha, with Sunday, Viśākhā-nakshatra and the *Varīya-yōga* while the Sun is in Mēsha, Jupiter in Dhanus, Mars in Makara and Saturn in Tulā. See *An Indian Ephemeris*, Vol. I, pt. i, p 60.
16. The word *iti* appears to suggest that the original earlier part of the introductory portion which is lost now, most probably contained a declaration like *Rēṭṭūraka-nivāsinaḥ sarvān=ēvam=ājñāpayati yathā* etc., by someone (*i.e.*, a king) referring to the desire of Mādhavavarman (line 5).
17. *Bhaṭṭagrāma* 'a village granted to the learned Brāhmaṇas'.
18. Evidently *āchandr-ārka-tūraṁ* is intended.
19. Read *vṛiddhiḥ*.
20. Cf. *mātā-pitrōr=mahādharma-ratna-kōśa-samṛiddhayē* (EI, XXXVII, p. 55, verse 5)
21. This passage indicates that an expression like *ētad-dharma-rakshā-kartuḥ* of this sentence is obviously lost in the previous line.
22. Note the epic *Parasmaipada* form *mōdati*.
23. Read *vasēt*.
24. Read *°tāñ=chhrēshṭha* or *°tāṁ śrēshṭha*.
25. Read *kṛichchhrē=pi* + + + + *pālayan*.
26. As in a Kushāṇa inscription (EI, XXXVII, p. 152, text line 3, p. 153 n.) and as in some of the epigraphs dated in the Gupta era (EI, XV, pp. 130ff; IHQ, VI, p. 53ff.), here too *kāyastha* may mean 'a writer'. (See EI, XXVII, p, 314, f. n. 1). Some, however, would take the word as a caste-name. See ibid. p. 314.
27. This name can be read as *Śrī-Vā*(*Bā*)*lēna* also.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

No. V : IPUR PLATES (SET II) OF MĀDHAVAVARMAN III, YEAR 47

This charter, found in Ipur (Tenali Taluk, Guntur District, A.P.) along with No. III, consists of a set of three thin copper plates (each measuring 7″ by 1.5″) and a ring (3 inches in diameter) with a much worn out circular seal divided by a cross-line into two sections. In the lower section the legend *Śrī-Mādhava*[*varmma*] in two lines, is very faintly visible, while the symbols in the upper section cannot be made out. The weight of the set is 30 *tolas*. The writing on the plates is much injured, especially on the last two faces. The following transcript is based on the plate of the record published in EI, XVII, facing p. 338.

TEXT

First Plate, Second Side

1 Svasti ||[1] Ku[d]ūrapurād[2]=ēkādaś-Āśvamēdh-āvabhṛith-āvadhūta-jagat-kalmasha-

2 sy=Āgnishṭōmasahasra-yājinō=nēka-sāmanta-makuṭa-kūṭa-ma-

3 ṇi-khachita-charaṇa-yugala-kamalasya mahārājasya śrī-Mā-

4 dhavavarmmaṇaḥ priya-naptā kshatriy-āvaskanda-pravarttit-āpraṭima-vi-

Second Plate, First Side

5 kh[yā]ta-parākramasya śrī-Dēvavarmmaṇaḥ priya-puttras=Trikūṭa-Malay-ādhipati-

6 r=nnaya-vinaya-sat[t*]va-sampannō bhagavach-Chhrīparvvata-svāmi-pādānu-

7 ddhyātō Vishṇukuṇḍ[ī][3]nām Mādhavavarmmā Murōdyakaḷikī-grāmē janān=ēvam=ā-

8 jñāpayati yathā || Yama-niyama-svādhyāya-kriyā-sampannābhyāṁ

Second Plate, Second Side

9 .....Agniśarm-Ēndra[śarmma]bhy[ā]-

10 m=ā.....kaḷik[ī]-

11 grāma[s=sa].....

12 ..jānapadaiḥ[4]=pariharttavya[ḥ*] parihārayitavyaś=cha [ḥ*] asya [śāsa]-

Third Plate, First Side

13 nasy=ājñā Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja-Guṇabhā(bha)rttā[5] || Saṁ [40] 7 Vā pa 7 di 7[6]||

14 Bahubhir=vasudhā dattā bahubhiś=ch=ānupālitā | yasya yasya yadā bhūmi-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

15 s=tasya tasya tadā phala[m ‖] [1*] Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā yō harēta vasu-
ndharām [|]

16 [gavāṁ] śata-sahasrasya hantuḥ=pibati kilbisha[m=iti ‖] (sham ‖ 2 ‖ iti ‖)

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. This punctuation mark is denoted by two dots one above the other.
2. The reading *[Ama]rapurād*=(EI, XVII, p. 338) is not supported by the facsimile.
3. The letters *kuṇḍinām* are engraved in small characters below the ring hole. There is nothing to support the view that the scribe struggled for space to insert the title *mahārāja* after the expression *Vishṇu-kuṇḍinām* (ED. p. 405),
4. The mutilated passage might have been something like—*śarmmabhyām=ā-chandr-ārkka-tāra-samaṁ Murōdyakalikī-grāmaḥ sarva-parihāra-sahitaḥ saṁpradattaḥ tad=avagatya sarvair=api jānapadaiḥ etc.*
5. Hultzsch read *Vishṇukuṇḍyadhirāja-dhyā-nōdāttā* while K.V. Lakshman Rao read *Vishṇukuṇḍy-Adhjrāja-Guṇavantau.*
6. Before this punctuation there is a spiral which Dr. Hultzsch takes for an *ōm*-symbol. *Saṁ* stands for *saṁvatsara, Vā, pa,* for the Prākritic *Vāsa-pakha*=Skt. *Varshā-paksha* and *di* for *dina.*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

No. VI : RAMATIRTHAM PLATES OF INDRAVARMAN, YEAR 27

This charter, from Rāmatīrtham (near Vizianagaram, Visakhapatnam District, A.P.) consists of three copper plates (8.25″ by 2″) and an oval copper ring (3″ by 3.6″) with an oval seal (1.5″ by 1.4″) showing the faint figure of an advancing lion or tiger (facing proper right) with its left fore-paw raised, neck errect, mouth wide-open, and the tail raised above the back so as to end in a loop. The set weighs 75 *tolas*. The following transcript is based on the plate of the record published in EI, XII, facing p. 134.

TEXT

First Plate, Second Side

1 Svasti[।*][1]Pura-Nisaṅgama-vāsakāt bhagavach-Chhrīparvvata-svāmi-pād-ānuddhyāta[ḥ*] sakalamahī-maṇḍal-āvanata-

2 sāmanta-makuṭa-maṇi-kiraṇ-āvalīḍha-charaṇa-yugō vikhyāta-yasāḥ śrīmanmahārāja-Mādhavavarmmā tasy=ō-

3 rjjita-śrī-Vishṇukuṇḍi-pārtthiv-ōdit-ōdit[2]-ānvaya-tilaka-samudbhūt[3]-aikādaś-Āśvamēdh-āvabhṛith-āvadhauta-jagat-kalma-

4 sha[sya*] Kratusahasra-ya(yā)jinaḥ snāna-puṇy-ōdaka[4]-pavitrīkṛita-śirasaḥ satputrō mātā-pitṛi-pādānudhyātō-bhaya-vaṁś-ātmaj[5]-ālaṅkāra-

Second Plate, First Side

5 bhūtaḥ śrīmān=Vikkramēndrākhyō rāj=āsy=āpi ch=ānēka-chāturddanta-samara-śata-sahasra-saṅghaṭṭa-vijayī priya-sūnuḥ chatur-u-

6 dadhi-nṛipati-makuṭa-maṇi-mayūkha-vichchhurita-pādāmburuhaḥ parama-māhēśvaraḥ śrīmān=Indravarmmākhyā(khyō) rājā Pḷakki-rāshṭrē Peru-

7 vāḍaka-grāma-samavētān=kuṭumbinas=samājñāpayati[।*] asty=ēsha Peruvāṭaka-grāmaḥ sva-puṇy-ābhiphala-vṛiddhayē[6]

8 [7]Māṇḍīrasagōtrāya Nagnaśarmmaṇē Taittī(tti)rīyaka-brahmāṇāy[8]=ā-chandratārakam=agrahārīkṛitya sarvva-kara-bhara-vipramuktō

Second Plate, Second Side

9 mayā tāmbra(mra)-śāsan-āṅkitō dattō=dhunā[।*] yushmābhir=apy=asmai brāhmaṇāya yad=atra phalam=uchitaṁ ta-

10 d=dātavyaṁ(vyaṁ) vachana-prēshaṇ[9]-ādikaṁ cha kāryyaṁ sarvvaṁ sadā karttavyaṁ(vyam)[।*] Mā(Ā)jñā svayaṁ=ēva[10][।*] yē cha bhavishya-bhāvinō rājā-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

11 naḥ tāṁś=cha bubōdhayāmi[11][।*] yushmābhir=apy=anumantavyō rakshita-
vyaś=cha sva-puṇya-phala-prāpty-arttha-

12 m=ētasminn=ēshō(v=ā)rtthē Vyāsa-Manu-gitāñ=chhlōkān=udāharanti ॥
Shashṭhiṁ(shṭiṁ) varsha-sahasrāṇi svarggē mōdati bhūmidaḥ[।*]

Third Plate, First Side

13 ākshēptā ch=ānumantā cha tāny=ēva narakē vasēt [॥1*] Bahubhir=vvasudhā
dattā bahubhiś=ch=ānupālitā[।*]yasya yasya ya-

14 dā bhūmi[s*]=tasya tasya tad[ā*] phalam[॥2*] Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā yatnā-
d=raksha Yudhishṭhiraḥ(ra ।) mahīm=mahimatāṁ śrēshṭha dānāch=chhrēyō-

15 nupālanaṁ(nam)[॥ 3*] Bhūmi-dānāt paraṁ dānaṁ(na)n=na bhūta[ṁ*] na
bhavishyati[।*] tasy=aiva haraṇāt=pāpaṁ na bhūtan=na bhavishyati । [। 4*]
Śrīmatō rājyakā-

16 laḥ varshshā(rshā)ṇ=Īndravarmmanaḥ saptā(pta)-viṁśatikaṁ[12] Jyēshṭha[13]-
māsa-śukla-paksha-saptamyāṁ dattō grāmaṁ(maḥ) [।*] [14]tasminn=ēva śāsana-
nisargga iti saṁbōdha-

17 nā tē ॥।-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. For a discussion on the meaning of the expression *Para-Nasaṅgama* see above Ch. V, sect. iii.
2. Cf. *mahaty=udit-ōditē Kākusth-ānvayē* in the Devagiri plates of the Kadamba Mṛigēśavarman (IA, VII, p. 35; text lines 6-7). In the *Arthaśāstra* a passage reads *purōhitam-udit-ōdita-kula-śīlam* (p. 15) and a commentary thereon seems to explain *udita* etc. as 'one whose ancestors upto four generations (or seven generations) are pure by birth'. (See the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*, K P. Kavgle Ed. pt. II, p. 19, n. 9). It is interesting to note that from Indravarman I down to Mādhavavarman II who is described in the passage in the present charter there had been only four generations of kings known in the Vishṇukuṇḍi family as we have seen earlier. Similarly upto Mṛigēśavarman there had been seven generations of rulers in the Kadamba dynasty. However Fleet rendered *udit-ōdita* as 'risen higher and higher' (IA, VII, p. 36) and Hultzsch took it in the sense of 'ever rising' (EI, XII, p. 136).
3. Read *tilakasy=aikādaśa* or *-ānvaya-samudbhūtasy=aikādaśa°*, or *ānvaya-samudbhūta-tilakasy-aikādaśa.*
4. Evidently *puṇy-ōdaka-snāna* is intended. Cf. *snāna-puṇyōdakēshu* in the *Mēgha.*, I, 1.
5. Read *°dhyāta ubhaya°. Ātmaja* may be superfluous.
6. Read *°puṇya phal-ābhivṛiddhayē.*
7. Hultzsch read *Māṇḍira°.*
8. Read *brāhmaṇāy=ā°.*
9. *Vachana-prēshaṇam* may be equal to *vachan=ānusṛitaṁ prēshaṇam* 'rendering service according to orders'. Cf. *pūrva-maryādayā sādhu prēshaṇaṁ karttavyam* in the Kanukallu plates of the Sālaṅkāyana Skandavarman (EI, XXXI, p. 9, text lines 13-14). However Hultzsch translated the passage in our record as 'perpetually perform every duty, (*viz.*,) conveying messages (?) etc.' (EI, XII, p. 136).
10. For Fleet's remark on the formula *ājñā svayam=ēva* see EI, VII, p. 183, n. 11.
11. Read *bōdhayāmi.*
12. Cf., *vatsarē sapta—triṁśatkē*, above No. I; line 13.
13. Hultzsch corrects into *Jyaishṭha.* But *Jyēshṭha* also is grammatically correct. See Bhānuji Dīkshita's *Vyākhyāsudhā* under *Nāma.* I, iv, verse 16.
14. *Tasminn=ēva* etc. is to be rendered probably as 'To you the order is that on the same (*day*) (or *in the same village*) the delivery of the charter (*must be made to the donee*)'. It seems that the office copy of the charter probably contained at the end the above instruction to the officer, in charge of drafting or issuing the copper plate charters, ordaining him that the record must be issued to the donee on the self same day without any delay or in the same gift village. The clerk who, as pointed out by Dr. Hultzsch, copied the office copy 'in a very careless manner', (EI, XII, p. 133), included unknowingly this sentence also. Hultzsch, however, read *sambōdhanāt* and treating it as a separate sentence, translated the passage *tasminn=ēva* etc. as 'in the same (year) the delivery of the edict (to the donee took place). The above (was written) under the instruction (of the king).' (EI, XII, p. 136). But the reading *saṁbōdhanā tē* is beyond doubt.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

No. VII : CHIKKULLA PLATES OF VIKRAMĒNDRAVARMAN II, YEAR 10

This charter discovered in the Chikkulla *agrahāra* (Tuni Division, East Godavari District, A.P.) consists of five copper plates, (each measuring about $7\frac{1}{8}''$ by $2\frac{1}{4}''$) and a copperring (about $\frac{1}{4}''$ thick and $3''$ in diameter) with a circular seal ($1\frac{3}{8}''$ in diameter) bearing in relief, on a slightly countersunk surface, a well executed lion, which stands to the proper right, raises the right fore-paw, opens the mouth, and apparently has a double tail. The weight of the set is not known. The sub-joined transcript is based on the plates of the record published in EI, IV, facing pp. 196-97.

TEXT

First Plate, Second Side

1 Siddham[1] Svasti [।*] Vijaya-Lēnduḷūra-vāsakād=bhagavataḥ Śrīparvvata-

2 svāmi-pād-ānuddhyātō[2] Vishṇukuṇḍi(ṇḍī)nāmmē(m=ē)-kādaś-Āśvamēdhāva-bhrit-ā-[3]

3 vadhauta-jagadka(t-ka)lmashasya Kratusahasra-yājina[ḥ*] Sarvvamēdh-āvāpta-

4 sarvva-bhūta-svārājasya Bahusuvarṇa-Pauṇḍarīka-Purushamēdha-

Second Plate, First Side

5 Vājapēya-Yūthya[4]-Shōḍaśi-Rājasūyaprādhirājya-Pra(Prā)jāpaty-ā-

6 dy-anēka-vividha-pṛithu-guru-[kratu*]-vara-śata-sahasra-yājina[ḥ*] kratu-var-ānushṭhā-

7 tādhishṭhā[5]-pratishṭhita-paramēshṭhitvasya mahārājasya sakala-jaga-

8 nmaṇḍala-vimala-guru-pri(pṛi)thu-kshitipati-makuṭa-maṇi-ga[ṇa]-

Second Plate, Second Side

9 nikar-āvana(dā)ta-pāda-yugaḷasya Mādhavavarmmaṇa[ḥ*] prana(ṇa)pt[ā]

10 Vishṇukuṇḍi-Vākāṭa[6]-vaṁśa-dvay-ālaṁkṛta-janmanaḥ śrī-Vikramēndravarmma-

11 ṇa[ḥ*] priya-naptā spu(sphu)ran-niśita-nistriṁśa-prabh-āvabhāvi(si)t-āśēsha-jagan-maṇḍa-

12 l-ādhishṭi(shṭhi)tasya bhru(bhrū)bhaṅgakara-vinirdhūta-samagra-dāyādasya anēka-chā-

Third Plate, First Side

13 tur-ddanta-saṁara-saṁghaṭṭa-dvirada-gaṇa-vipula-vijayasya yathā-vidhi-

14 viniryyāpita-ghaṭik-āvāpta-puṇya-saṁchayasya satata-bh[ū]mi-gō-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

15 kanyā-hiraṇya-pradāna-pratilabdha-puṇya-jīvit-ōpabhōgasya pa-
16 rama[mā*]hēśvarasya mahāra(rā)jasya śrī-Indra[7]bhaṭṭārakavarmmaṇa[ḥ*] priya-

Third Plate, Second Side

17 j[y]ēshṭha-putrō garishṭa(shṭhaḥ) śaiśava ēva sakala-nṛipa-guṇ-ālaṁkṛita-
18 sya[8] samyag=adhyārōpita-sakala-rājya-bhāra[ḥ*] parama-māhēśvarō
19 mahārāja[ḥ*] śri(śrī)mān=Vikramēndravarmmā ēvam=ājñāpayati [।*] Nata-
paṭyāṁ Kṛi-
20 shṇabe[ṇṇ]ā-taṭē Rāvirēva-grāmasya dakshiṇa-pūrvvasyāṁ diśi Rēgō-

Fourth Plate, First Side

21 nṛan=nāma grāma[ḥ*] sakala-jaga[t*]-traya-nāthasya śiśu-śaśi-kar-āvadā-
22 ta-śubhrīkṛita-jaṭā-makuṭasya bhagavatas=Triymbha(mba)kasya[9] bhavatē
23 Sōmagirēśvarānāthāya dattaṁ[।*] rājñā vachanād=gāravēṇ=ājñāṁ kā-
24 rayiti[10] [। yaḥ*] kaśchid=ēnam=pālāyati sō[11] Rudralōkē dēva-gaṇa-

Fourth Plate, Second Side

25 kōṭī-sa(śa)ta-sahasrēṇa svarggīna-sukhaṁ mōdati[12][॥*] Vija-
26 ya-rājya-saṁvassa(tsa)rambuḷ[13] 10 māsa-pakkaṁ 8 gihmā 5 [॥*]
27 Bahubhir=vvasudhā datt[ā] bahubhiś=ch=ānupālitā [।*] yasya
28 yasya yadā bhūmiṁ(mis)=tasya tasya tadā phalam [॥1*]

Fifth Plate, First Side

29 Sva-dattaṁ(ttāṁ) para-dattaṁ(ttāṁ) vā yō harēti(ta) vasundharām [।*]
30 shashṭiṁ varsha-sahasrāṇi narakē pachyatē dhruvam [॥2*]
31 Gāvō(ś=cha) bhūmi[ṁ*] tathā bharyyā a(ā)kramya hara mā nayā(ya) [।*]
32 srāvayanti [hi*] rājānāṁ(naṁ) brahma-hatyā[14] cha lipyati(tē) ॥ [3*]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Expressed by a symbol.
2. Correctly—*svāminaḥ pādānudhyātō*. It is to be construed with *Vikramēndravarmmā* in line 19.
3. Read-*āvabhṛith-ā*°
4. Read °*pēy-ōkthya-*
5. Read °*sh̤ṭhān-ādhish̤ṭhita-pratish̤ṭhita-*.
6. The usual form is *Vākāṭaka*, However, *Vākāṭa* of the present record seems to indicate that *ka* of the former form is a Taddhita suffix in *svārtha* (*Vākāṭā ēva Vākāṭakāḥ*) *i.e.*, in the sense of the base itself and not in any other sense as believed by some writers. (e.g., in JBORS, XIX, p. 67; *A New Hist. of the Ind. People*, VI, p. 96; JIH, XLIX, pp. 135 ff; etc. Cf. also above Ch. II, note 63.
7. Read *śr-Īndra-*
8. Following No. VIII, line 14, read °*laṁkṛitatvāt=samyag*°-
9. Correctly *Tryambakāya*. But cf. *Triyambakaṁ saṁyaminaṁ dadarśa* of Kālidāsa (*Kumārasaṁbhava*, III, verse 44) and Mallināṭha's commentary thereunder. Read also *nāthāya+++makuṭāya bhagavatē Trayambakāya bhavatē Sōmagirēśvarānāthāya dattaḥ* in lines 21-23. Here the reference is to the god Tryambaka (*i.e.*, Śiva) the lord or husband of Sōmagirēśvarā (*i.e.*, Pārvatī). See Ch. X, sect. iii. Again the same may also denote Śiva as the lord of the Moon (*Sōma*) and Pārvatī (*Girēśvarā i.e., Sōmasya Girēśvarāyāś=cha nāthaḥ*). Cf. the name Vāgadhīśvarī (*i.e.*, the supreme queen of speech) of Pārvatī (The *Lalitāsahasranāma*, 640). The word *bhavatē* in the passage of the record may be in the verbal sense 'present'. See SED, s.v. *bhavat*. Cf. EI, IV, pp. 194, 198.
10. Probably *rājñō vachana-gauravēṇ=ājñāṁ kāray=ēti* is intended. This sentence, evidently of the concerned higher officer, contains an instruction, originally in the office copy, given to the *ājñā* or the executor of the grant. Cf. the last sentence of No. VI and note thereunder.
11. Read *pālayati sa.*
12. Read *svargiṇā sukhaṁ mōdati.* Note the *Parasmaipada.*
13. As has been suggested (EI, IV, p. 197, n. 2) this word may be an equivalent of *saṁvatsaramulu* of the Telugu inscriptions. As Kielhorn has stated the word *māsa* in what follows is quite meaningless and the whole passage containing the date, expressed in Sanskrit, would be *svaṁvatsarē 10 grīshmapakshē 8 [divasē*] 5.*
14. *Hatyā* may be the Instrumental of *hati* 'killing'.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

No. VIII : TUMMALAGUDEM PLATES (SET II) OF VIKRAMĒNDRA-VARMAN II, YEAR 11, ŚAKA 488

This charter, discovered in a well (near the findspot of No. I) in Tummalagudem (Ramanapeta Taluk, Nalgonda District, A.P.) consists of five copper plates (each measuring 18.7 cm. by 6.4 cm.) with a ring hole, though neither the ring nor the seal was found. The set weighs 1035 g. The following transcript is based on the plate of the record facing EA, II, pp. 15ff.

TEXT

First Plate, Second Side[1]

1 D[ī]ptyā diṅ-maṇḍalaṁ vyāptaṁ yasya bal-ārkka-tējasaḥ [।*] Satyāśraya-suta[ḥ*]
śrīmān=sa jayaty=Uttamāśraya[ḥ ॥1*]

2 Svasti [।] Bhagavach-Chhrī[pa]rvvatasvāmi-pād-ānuddhyān-āvapta-prajā-paripā-
lan-ādhikārāṇām brahma-kshatra-

3 tējō-bhṛitāṁ Vishṇu-vikrama-naya-sampadāṁ Vishṇukuṇḍīnāṁ shaḍabhijña-[2]
prātihārya[3]-darśa-

4 n-ānugraha-janita-sugata-śāsan-ābhiprasādasya[4] vibudha-bhavana-pratisparddhi-
śōbhā-

5 samu[da]y-ānēka-mahā-vihāra-pratishṭhāpan-ādhigat-ānanta-[5]brāhma-puṇyasaṁ-
bhārasya mahā-

6 rāja-śrī-Gōvindavarmmaṇaḥ putrasy=aikādaś-Āśvamēdha[6]-Bahusuvarṇṇa-
Pauṇḍarīka-Vājapēya-

7 Kratusahasra-Sarvvamēdha-Rājasūya-Purushamēdh-ādy-ahar-ahas-samyag-anus-
hṭhita-śruti-vi-

Second Plate, First Side

8 hit-āśēsha-dushkara-kāmya-karm[m]-ānushṭhānasya prāg-dakshiṇ-āpar-āmbuni-
dhi-Rēvā-sarit-salila-vala-

9 ya-vibhūshaṇāyā bhuvō bharttur=mmahārāja-śrī-Mādhavavarmmaṇaḥ priya-
putrasya Vākāṭakamahā-

10 dēvī-sutasya mahākavēḥ paramasaugatasya mahārāja-śrī-Vikramēndrasya
sūnōr=anē-

11 ka-chāturddanta-vijay-ādhigat-āśēsha-chakravarttikshētr-ādhipatyasya sphura-
dkha(t-kha)ḍga-

12 kara-sahasr-āvalī-[7]parigata-sva-bhuja-[d]inakara-prabhā[va]-viddhvast-āśēsha-dā-
yāda-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

13 maṇḍala-ghana-timira-[pa]ṭalasya śr-Indrabhaṭṭārakavarmmaṇaḥ priya-sūnus= tad-anurūpa-

14 śauryy-ātiśaya-samasta-rāja-ri(ṛi)shi-guṇa-sampad-yōga-sāmartthyāt=p rakṛiti-ma-ṇḍalēna

Second Plate, Second Side[8]

15 śaiśava ēv=ārōpita-rājya-bhāraḥ parama-dhārmmikō dharmma-vijayī praṇat-ānēka-sāmanta-ma-

16 kuṭa-maṇi-mayūkh-ōdbhāsita-vara-charaṇa-yugaḷaḥ śrī[mā]n=Vikramēndra-bhaṭṭārakavarmm=ān-ā-

17 gata-kāla-bhāvinaḥ sva-para-vaṁś-ālaṅkāra-bhūtān=sarvvān=ēva rāja-ri(ṛi)-shīn=anurūpē-

18 ṇa satkṛity=ēttham=avabōdhayati yathā [l*] prathita-prabhāv-ānya-rāja-vaṁśa-sātmī-

19 bhūta[9]-pṛithivīpati-pada-prasahy-āharaṇa-vyakta-niratiśaya-mahimānaṁ śrī-Mā-

20 dhavarāj-ābhidhānaṁ suta-chchhalēna manōhar-ākāra-baddhaṁ naya-parākram-ādi-guṇa-sandō-

21 ham=abhiprajātāyā[10] Vishṇukuṇḍi-kula-bahumat-aika-sambandhit-ābhikhyāta-māhātmya-

Third Plate, First Side

22 m=aśēsha-sāmanta-kula-tilakāyamān-ābhijanam=avikala-guṇa-maṇi-kiraṇa-nika-

23 ra-vichchhurita-vipula-digantarālaṁ śrī-Pṛithivīmūlarāja-vaṁśam=utpatti-parigrahēṇa

24 Śriy=ēva sāgaram=alaṁkṛitavatyā prati-vishayam=atibahu-prakāra-manō-ram-ō-

25 dāra-karmm-ādbhuta-stūpa-vihāra-chūḷāmaṇibhir=alaṁkṛita-sakala-Dakshiṇā-

26 pathasya Śrī-Pārvvatēya-pūrvv-āpara-kshitipati-paraṁparā-hāra-maddhya-niru-

27 pama-virājitayā[11]-Kaustubhāyamāna-yaśō-janmanaḥ guṇa-rūpa-saṁpadbhi-

Third Plate, Second Side[12]

28 r=anugata-Gōvindasya śrī-Gō[vi]ndarājasya mūrttimatīṁ Śriyaṁ praty= avishayīkṛita-ma-

29 nōrathayā[13] Parama[bha]ṭṭārikāmahādēvyā śrīmad-Indrapuram=uchchair= alaṁkarttu-kāma-

30 y=ēva pratishṭhāpitē śrīmati Paramabhaṭṭārikāmahāvihārē=smābhi[ḥ] pra-varddhamā-

31 na-vijaya-rājya-saṁvatsar-aikādaśē[14] Kārttika-māsa-kṛishṇapaksh-āshṭa-

32 myāṁ chāturddiś-āryya-vara-bhikshu-saṁgha-paribhōgāya sarvva-dāna-sahi-

33 tas=sarvva-bri(bā)dh[ā]-parihārēṇa Irundōṛō[15] nāma gramō dattaḥ

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Fourth Plate, First Side

34 sa sarvvair=ēva rāja-ri(ṛi)shibhiḥ śruti-smṛiti-sadāchār-ānuvṛi[ttibhiḥ] samyak=pari-

35 pālanīyaḥ[।*] yaś=ch=ātra lōbha-pramād-ājñāna-kshudra-parivāra-dōsha-vaśād=dharmma-

36 vilōpāya pravarttēta tasy=ēmāni smṛiti-vihitāni pātakāni bhavanti ॥ Nigghna-

37 tāṁ [bha]rtṛi-gō-vipra-bāla-yōshid-vipaśchitaḥ [।*] yā gatis=sā bhavēd=vṛi-

38 ttiṁ harataḥ śāsan-āṁkitām ॥ [2*] Bahubir=vvasudhā dattā bahubhiś=ch=ānu-

39 pālitā [।*] yasya yasya yadā bhūmis=tasya tasya tadā phalam ॥ [3*] Shashṭiṁ

Fourth Plate, Second Side[16]

40 varsha-sahasrāṇi svarggē tishṭhati bhūmidaḥ [।*] ākshēptā ch=ānumantā cha tāny=ēva

41 narakē vasēt ॥ [4*] Kṛitvā pallava-bha[ṁ]ga-pēlava-balaṁ Siṁh-āhvayaṁ[17] Pallavaṁ pratyā-

42 vṛitya yad=āgataḥ prathamataś=Śakr-ābhidhānaṁ puraṁ(ram) [।*] prādā-ch=chhāsanam=Uttamāśraya

43 iti khyātas=tad=ēdaṁ nṛipaḥ s-āshṭāśīti-chatuḥ-śatē Śakapatēs=saṁva-

44 tsarāṇāṁ gatē ॥ [5*] Yēn=ōddhṛitā bhartṛi-kulasya lakshmīr=adhaḥ=patantī naya-vi-

45 kramābhyā[m] [।*] ājñāpanā khyāta-kula-prasūtaḥ śrī-Mūlarājaḥ sa nṛipēshu mukhyaḥ[18] ॥। [6*]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. This side bears the number *1* in the left margin against line 4.
2. For the six kinds of *abhijñā* and for different views regarding the meaning of the word see BD, p. 106 ff.
3. *Prātihārya* (Pāli *paṭihāriya*) means 'magic' or 'miracle'. When it is used with *darśana* or *dēśanā* 'sermon', it signifies the magic of mindreading. Cf. *Dēśanā Lōkanāthānāṁ sattvāśaya-vaśānugāḥ* of the *Bōdhichittavivaraṇa* quoted in the *Bhāmatī* under *Br. S.* II, ii, 18. For the other two *prātihāryas* see *Dharma.*, p. 32, sect. CXXXIII. Cf. BD., p. 106. See also EI, IX, pp. 54, 56.
4. *Abhiprasāda* means 'faith'. Cf. *Buddha-Śāsanābhiprasādārtham* (*Divyāvadāna*, p. 423).
5. *Brāhma* means 'best'. Cf. *Brahmā ti seṭṭha-vachanam*. See PED, s.v. See also BD, p. 226.
6. Originally *maidha* seems to have been written.
7. Originally *pu* seems to have been written.
8. This side bears number *2* in the margin against line 17.
9. *Sātmībhūta*, 'beneficial to oneself'. Cf. *Sātmyam=iti ātma-sukhaṁ yat=karōti tad=uchyatē* (Dālhaṇa's commentary under *Suśrutasaṁhitā*, Ch. XXXI, verse 41).
10. Read *abhiprajātayā*. Cf. the usage *śabdaṁ kuryuḥ prajātā prajātā dhanyaṁ dhanyaṁ putram=iti* in the *Charakasaṁhitā*, *Śarīrasthāna*, (Chapter VIII, sect. 40, p. 348). Here in the present record the queen is described to have given birth under the pretext of a son (*suta-chchhalēna*) to the very heap of virtues etc., bearing the name Mādhavarāja. Cf. *nṛipa-chchhalēna kiṁ Vishṇuḥ daitya-jishṇur=ayaṁ svayam* in a Kadamba charter (EI, XXXIII, p. 90, verse 5). So here there is no reference to any adoption of Mādhavarāja by Vikramēndravarman II (Cf. JIH, XLIII, p. 737). For the untenable views that this Mādhavarāja was a son or a cousin brother of Vikramēndravarman II himself see the *Bhārati*, 1967, November p. 37 and JIH, L, p. 5 ff.
11. Read *virājita-Kaustubhā°*.
12. This side seems to bear the number *3* against line 30.
13. Here the construction *Gōvindarājasya +++a-vishayīkṛita-manōrathayā* with a *s-āpēkṣha-samāsa* may be compared with a similar construction *a-pravishṭa-vishayasya rakshasāṁ dvāratām=agamad=Antakasya tat* (*Raghu.* XI, verse 18). Here the passage in our record tells us in a poetic way that on account of Paramabhaṭṭārikā, Gōvindarāja did not crave for Śrī (goddess Lakshmī) having corporeal body. It is a way of saying Paramabhaṭṭārikā was Gōvindarāja's wife. Cf. JIH, XLIII, p. 746.
14. Read *saṁvatsara ēkādaśē*.
15. This name has been read as *Iruṇḍoro* (*Bhārati*, 1965, July, pp 6 ff) and as *Iruṇḍeṛō* (JIH, Vol. XLIII, pp. 733 ff.)
16. This side bears the numeral *4* in the left margin against line 41.
17. This name has been read as *Siṁhātyayaṁ* (*Bhārati*, 1965, July, p. 12) and *Siṁhānvayaṁ* (ibid., 1967, November, p. 38).
18. The metres of these two verses are respectively *Śārdūlavikrīḍita* and *Upajāti*. The fifth plate of the set is left unengraved.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

No. IX : KANDULAPALEM PLATES OF VIKRAMĒNDRAVARMAN II, YEAR 14

This charter, discovered in the village Kandulapalem (Ramachandrapuram Taluk, East Godavari District, A.P.) contains a set of five plates not of uniform size (measuring respectively: (1) 6.2″ by 1.725″, (2) 6″ by 1.65″; (3) 6.4″ by 1.725″, (4) 6.4″ by 1.75″ and (5) 5.95″ by 1.75″) and a copper ring (.3″ in thickness and 2.5″ in diameter) with a bronze oval seal (1.05″ by .875″) bearing the emblem of a standing humped bull facing proper left, with a symbol of crescent, above which there is a solar symbol somewhat damaged. The whole set weighs 56.5 *tolas*. The sub-joined transcript is based on the plates of the charter published in EI, XXXVI facing pp. 10 ff. and in APGAS, No. 8.

TEXT

First Plate, Second Side[1]

1 Svasti [I*] Bhagavach-Chhrīparvvatasvāmi-pād-ānuddhyātasya Vishṇukuṇḍī-
nā[m]
2 ēkādaś-Āśvamēdh-āvabhṛith-āvadhauta-jagat-kalma-
3 shasya Kratusahasra-yājinaḥ Sarvvamēdh-āvāpta-sarvva-bhūta-
4 svārājyasya Bahusuvarṇṇ-aikadaśaka-yājinaḥ

Second Plate, First Side

5 ēkādaśa-Pauṇḍarīka-prāpta-sarvva-rddhēḥ yathā-vid[dh]y=anu-
6 shṭhita-Rājasya(sū)y-ōpapādit-ādhirājyasya tada-
7 nu Purushamēdh-ādy-aśēsha-kraty-anushṭhāna-jani-
8 ta-pāramēshṭhyasya dēvātidēvasya[2] mahārāja-

Second Plate, Second Side[3]

9 śrī-Mādhavavarmmaṇaḥ priya-sūnōr=Vvishṇukuṇḍi-Vā-
10 kāṭaka-vaṁśa-dvay-ālaṁkṛita-janmanaḥ pratāp-ō-
11 panata-sakala-sāmanta-[makuṭa-maṇi*]-mañjari-piñjarita-
12 charaṇa-kamala-yugalasya mahārāja-

Third Plate, First Side

13 śrī-Vikramēndrabhaṭṭāraka-varmmaṇaḥ priya-sūnōr=Vvishṇukuṇḍi-
14 kula-tilakasya samāghrāta-mātra-trasta-kāndi-
15 śībhūta-viśīrṇṇa-pranashṭ-āśēsha-dāyādasya sva-
16 dakshiṇ-aika-bāhu-sāhāyy-ōchchair-nīta-sva-va[ṁ*]śa-kram-āga-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Third Plate, Second Side

17 t-ādhirājyasya anēka-chāturddanta-samara-saṁghaṭṭa-vijayina[ḥ]
18 parama-Māhēśvarasya parama-brahmaṇyasya yathā-vidhi-
19 viniryyāpita-ghaṭik-āvāpta-puṇya-sañchayasya
20 dharmma-vijayinō mahārāj-Ēndrabhaṭṭāraka-varmmaṇa[ḥ*]

Fourth Plate, First Side

21 priya-putra[ḥ] śrī-Vishṇukuṇḍy-anvaya-makuṭa-chūlāmaṇiḥ
22 Hara iv=āpratihata-prabhāvaḥ sakala-bhuvaṇa-rakṣhā-
23 bhār-aikāśraya[ḥ*] mahanīya-guṇa-ma-
24 hī-Mahēndraḥ Vikramēndrabhaṭṭārai(ra)kavarmmā Vaiyērakarē

Fourth Plate, Second Side

25 Tūṇḍī-nāmadhēya-grāmē [grāmē*]yakā[n*] ēvam=ājñāpaya-
26 ti yathā [1*] asmai Āki-vastavyāya Kauṇḍinya-
27 sagōtrāya Āpastamba-sūtra-pāra[ṁ]gatāya
28 Rudraśarmmaṇaḥ putrāya Śvāmiśarmmaṇē Chamūpū(pu)rā-pārśvē[4] Tūṇḍi-grāmō=

Fifth Plate, First Side

29 smābhir=ddattaḥ sarvva-bādh[ā]-parihārēṇa datta ity=ēsh=ājñā-
30 panā [1*] ājñāptaṁ[5] sva-mukham=ēvaḥ(va) [1*] imāni cha pātakāni
31 vilōpayataḥ[1*] Vi(Ni)ghnatāṁ mātṛi-gō-vipraḥ(pra)-bāla-yō-
32 shi[t*]-tapasvinaḥ [1*] yā gatis=sā bhavēd=vṛitti[ṁ*] haratāś=śāsanāṁkitāḥ-(tām) || [1*]

Fifth Plate, Second Side

33 [Bahu]bhir=vvasudhā dattā [ba]hubhiś=ch=ānupālitā |
34 yasya yasya yadā bhūmi[ḥ] tasya tasya tadā phalam ||[2*]
35 Saṁva[6] 10 4 Grī[7] [2] di[8] Pratipadi ||[9]

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. This side of the plate bears the number 1 on the left margin.
2. See Appendix IV.
3. This side of the plate bears the number *2* on the left margin.
4. This expression is engraved in the lower margin below line 28. The intended reading may also be *Tūṇḍi-grāmaḥ Chamū-purā-pārśvē=smābhiḥ* etc. See Ch. IX, sect. i (8).
5. *Ptaṁ* is redundent.
6. This is an abbreviation of *saṁvatsarē*.
7. This is a contraction of *Grīshma-pakshē*.
8. This stands for *dinē*.
9. After this, about ten letters, perhaps originally engraved, have been hammered out.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

No. X : POLAMURU PLATES (SET I) OF MĀDHAVAVARMAN IV, YEAR 48

This charter, discovered in the village Polamūru (Ramachandrapuram Taluk, East Godavari District, A.P.) consists of a set of four thin copper plates (each measuring $6\frac{3}{8}''$ by $2\frac{1}{2}''$) strung together on an oval ($3\frac{1}{4}''$ by $2\frac{7}{8}''$) copper ring ($\frac{1}{4}''$ in thickness). The seal is missing. The set weighs about $41\frac{1}{2}$ *tolas*. The subjoined transcript is based on the plates of the record published in JAHRS, VI, pp. 19 ff.

TEXT

First Plate, Second Side[1]

1 Svasti [l*] Bhagavatśrī(ch-Chhrī)parvatasvāmi-pād-ānudhyātasya Vishṇuko-ṇḍi[ī][2]nām=a-ppra-

2 tihata-śāsanasya sva-pratāp-ōpanata-sāmanta-manujapati-maṇḍalasya

3 virahita-ripu-shaḍ-vargasya[3] vī(vi)dhi[va*]d-upachita[4]-trivarggasya vibudha-pati-sāddhya-

4 śara-vi(vī)r[y]a-vibhava-bala-parākramasya śrī-Vikramahēndrasya[5] sūnō[ḥ*] anēka-

5 samara-saṁghaṭṭa-vijayinaḥ para-narapati-makuṭa-maṇi-mayu(yū)kh-āvadā-ta-cha-

6 [ra*][6]ṇa-yuguḷasya vikramāśrayasya śrī-Gōvindavarmaṇaḥ priya-tanayaḥ atula-

7 [ba*][6]la-parākrama-yaśo-dāna-vinaya-sa[ṃ]paṁ(pa)[n*]nō [7]daśa-śata-sakala-dharaṇī-tala-nara-

Second Plate, First Side

8 patir = [8]avasita-vividha-divya-strī[9]-vara-nagara-bhavana-gata-parama-yuvati-jana-vi-

9 haraṇa-ratir=anna(n-a)nya-nṛipati-sādhāraṇa-dāna-māna-dayā-dama-dhṛiti-

10 mati-kshānti-kānti-śauriy[10]-ōdāryya-gaṁbhīryya-prabhṛity-anēka-guṇa-saṁpa-

11 j-janita-raya-samutthita-bhūmaṇḍala-vyāpi-vipula-yaśōḥ(śāḥ) Kratusā-

12 hasra-yājī Hiraṇyagarbha-prasūtaḥ ēkādaś-Āśvamēdh-āvabhṛitha-snāna-vi-

13 ga[mi*]ta-jagad-ēnaskaḥ sarva-bhūta-parirakshaṇa-chuñchuḥ vidva[d*]-dvija-guru-vri(vṛi)-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

14 ddha-tapasvi-janāśrayō mahārājaḥ śrī-Mādhavavarmā [|*] api cha ni(na)yam= Au-

Second Plate, Second Side[11]

15 śanasaṁ sa[t*]tvaṁ Kaiśavaṁ kāntim=Aindavīṁ(vīm) udvahann=urubhā bhāti[|*][12] Vikramād=[ā]-

16 pta-bhūri-bhūḥ apy=asau mahītala-nṛipati-bhāskaraḥ[13] parama-brahmaṇyō

17 mātā-pitru(tṛi)-pād-ānudhyātaḥ Janāśraya-mahārājaḥ Guddāvadi-visha-

18 yyē(yē) vishaya-mahā(ha)ttarān=adhikāra-purushāṁś=cha imaṁ=arttham= ājñāpa-

19 yaty=asti [|*] viditam=astu vō yath=āsmābhi[ḥ] Kuddavādi-vishayē Daḷiya-

20 vāvi-tīrē Pulō[ṁbū]ru-nāma-grāmaḥ Mayindavāṭaki-dakshiṇata-si-[14]

21 māntē chatu[r*]-nivarttanañ=cha kshētraṁ yugapat=[sa]ṁpra[t*]taṁ prāg- di[g*]-jigīshayā prasthi-

Third Plate, First Side

22 taḥ Gōdāvar[ī]m=atitaran[15] vēda-vēdāṁga-vidō Rudraśarmmaṇō naptrē sva- [pitu]-

23 r=adhika-guṇ-ādhyāsita[16]-tanōḥ Dāmaśarmmaṇaḥ putrāya Śivaśarmmaṇē Gauta-

24 ma-sagōtrāya Karmmarāshṭrē Kuṇrura-vāsatavyāya Taittirika[17]-sabrahma- chāriṇē

25 vēda-chatushṭaya-samāmnāt-āvadāt-ānanāya sva-karmmānu-

26 shṭhāna-parāya Phālguṇyāṁ(nyāṁ) Paurṇamāsyāṁ Sōma-rāhu-sagraha- nimit[t]ē

27 Janāśraya-dat[t*]yā[18] sarvva-kara-parihārēṇ=āgrahāri(rī)kṛitya saṁprattaḥ [|*] ta-

28 thā bhavadbhir=anyaiś=cha dharm-ādhiśata[19]-buddhibhiḥ paripālanīyaḥ na kai-

Third Plate, Second Side[20]

29 śchid=bādhā karaṇīyā [|*] ājñāptiritra hastikōśa-vīrakōśau[21] [|*] [22]Mahā-

30 mātra-yōdhyōs=tēshāṁ śrēyah=kīrtir=idaṁ mahat [|*]yē

31 na(tu) lōbhēna lumpanti śvapākā(ka)s=tēshu jāyatē [||1*] Anyāya-

32 sama-kālē tu sthātavyaṁ śaktitaḥ purā [|*] upēkshati

33 punar=yyatra(ś=cha) narakē sa nimajjati [||2*] Ity=ēvam=ubhaya-

34 guṇau [manasi*] sthirīkṛityā(tya) paripālayēt [|*] atra Vyasa-gītā[ḥ*] ślōkā[ḥ] [|*]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Fourth Plate, First Side[23]

35 Bahubhir=vasudhā dattā bahubhiś=ch=ānupāli-

36 tā [|] yasya yasya yādā bhūmis=tasya tasya tadā phalaṁ(lam) || [3*] Sva-da-

37 ttāṁ para-dattām vā(ttāṁ vā) yō harēti(ta) vasuṇdharā[m |*] shashṭhi(shṭi)-varusha[24]-sahaśrā-

38 ṇi vishṭhāyāṁ jāyatē kru(kṛi)mi[ḥ ||4*] Shashṭhi(shṭi)-varsha-sahasrāṇi

39 svargē mōdati bhūmidaḥ [*|] ākshētta[25] ch=ānumantā cha tany=ēva

40 narakē vasēt [||5*] Na visham visham=ity=āhuḥ brahma-svaṁ visham=uchyatē [|*] visham=ē-

41 kāki[naṁ] hanti brahma-svaṁ putra-pautrikaṁ(kam) [||6*] Vijaya-rājya-saṁvatsarē 40 8[26] [||*]

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. This side of the plate bears the number 1 in the left margin.
2. The medial sign, though doubtful, looks more like *ī* than *i* in the facsimiles.
3. Cf. *ari-shaḍ-varga-tyāgēn=ēndriya-jayaṁ kurvīta* (*Artha* p. 12). Cf. also *śatru-shaḍ-varga-nigraha-paraḥ* an epithet of Mahēndravarman I, a contemporary of Mādhavavarman IV. See *Matta*, p. 41.
4. Cf. *Manu*, VII, verses 26-27. Cf. also *vidhivad=upachitābhiḥ śaktibhiś=Śakra-kalpaḥ* in the Aihole *praśasti* (EI, VI, p. 6, verse 25).
5. Scholars are unanimous in taking this name as a variation of Vikramēndra.
6. This letter is lost as the plate is broken away here.
7. See Appendix VII.
8. See Appendix VIII.
9. The ring above *stra*, representing the medial sign, is not complete and its end is slightly turned inward, as in the case of *śrī* in line 1 above. R.S. Panchamukhi correctly read *s=Trīvara* only (EI. XXIII, p. 91 and n. 6). Lakshman Rao also seems to read *s=Trīvara* (JDL, XI, p. 59). See also Appendix VIII.
10. Read *Śaury-audārya*. In this compound *raya* may mean 'force', 'velocity'.
11. This side of the plate bears the number *2* in the left margin.
12. The portion starting from *nayam=Auśa-nasam* down to *bhūri-bhūḥ* makes one complete stanza in the *Anushṭubh* metre. Yet, because the author intends to have a *Virōdhābhāsa* in the passage *Vikramād=āpta +++bhāskaraḥ* (see below), and because an instance where a part of a verse making a sentence with the succeeding prose passage is not known, a full-stop is introduced here after *bhāti*. The passage *nayam=Auśanasaṁ+++bhāti* means 'having the political wisdom of Uśanas (*i.e.*, Śukra, the Venus), the strength of Kēśava (*i.e.*, Budha, the Mercury; or Vishṇu) (*and*) the lustre of Indu (*i.e.*, the Moon) (*this Mādhavavarman*) shines (as) the very *urubhās* (*i.e.*, the Sun).' Cf. *Budhaṁ Nārāyaṇaṁ vidyāt* etc. in the *Bōdhāyana-Gṛihya-sūtra*, I, xvi, verse 43. Here evidently the author of the Polamuru plates, like Subandhu, famous for *Ślēshālaṁkāra* wants to compare his hero with the planets. See *Vāsaṇya.*, p. 77.
13. The passage *Vikramād+++bhāskaraḥ* contains *Ślēshālaṁkāra*. For *vi* means sky or bird (*i.e.*, Garuḍa); *krama*=course, or uninterrupted progress; *Vikrama*=valour or Vikramēndravarman; *bhūri-bhū*=the moon (who has many births) or one having vast earth. The *Vāsavadattā* and *Kādambarī* are noted for similar and more striking puns and consequent *Virōdhābhāsas*. Therefore to dub the language of the Polamuru record as totally "bad" (SS, p. 131, n.) is to overlook the nuance and subtility of the language. The utterly

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

defective passage in the record is in the imprecatory portion.

14. *Ta* is redundent. *Sima* is taken sometimes as a synonym of *sīmā* 'boundary'.
15. Read *prasthitaiḥ+++atitaradbhiḥ*.
16. This letter *ta* originally forgotten is added later in small character below the line.
17. Read *Taittirīya-*
18. Cf. *a-pūrvadattyā* of the Vākāṭaka records (CII, V, pp. 7-8, lines 14-15; pp. 12-13, lines 23-24; etc.); *Sarvasiddhi-dattyā* (No. XVII, line 20); *gaṇadattiḥ* on the seal of Svāmirāja's plates, year 322 (CII, IV, plate facing p. 617). See also Ch. IX, sect. ii, note 110.
19. Read *-gata-*. The same *-śata* occurs in the Polamuru set II also.
20. This side bears the number *3* in the left margin.
21. Read *ājñaptir=atra* etc. See Ch. VI, sect. ii.
22. This verse and the next are not found anywhere else. Hence it is difficult to give a correct version of them precisely.
23. This side of the plate bears the number *4* in the left margin.
24. Read *varsha-*
25. Read either *ākshēptā* or *āchchhēttā*.
26. The numeral *8* is engraved below *40*. Dr. Sircar prefers to read the regnal year of the record as *40* only. But he does not rule out its being *48 i.e., 40[+*]8*. See SS, p. 104, n.; CA, p. 208.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Fourth Plate, First Side[23]

35 Bahubhir=vasudhā dattā bahubhiś=ch=ānupāli-

36 tā [I] yasya yasya yādā bhūmis=tasya tasya tadā phalaṁ(lam) II [3*] Sva-da-

37 ttāṁ para-dattām vā(ttāṁ vā) yō harēti(ta) vasuṇdharā[m I*] shashṭhi(shṭi)-varusha[24]-sahaśrā-

38 ṇi vishṭhāyāṁ jāyatē kru(kṛi)mi[ḥ ||4*] Shashṭhi(shṭi)-varsha-sahasrāṇi

39 svargē mōdati bhūmidaḥ [*I] ākshēttā[25] ch=ānumantā cha tany=ēva

40 narakē vasēt [||5*] Na visham visham=ity=āhuḥ brahma-svaṁ visham= uchyatē [I*] visham=ē-

41 kāki[naṁ] hanti brahma-svaṁ putra-pautrikaṁ(kam) [||6*] Vijaya-rājya-saṁvatsarē 40 8[26] [||*]

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. This side of the plate bears the number 1 in the left margin.
2. The medial sign, though doubtful, looks more like *ī* than *i* in the facsimiles.
3. Cf. *ari-shaḍ-varga-tyāgēn=ēndriya-jayaṁ kurvīta* (*Artha* p. 12). Cf. also *śatru-shaḍ-varga-nigraha-paraḥ* an epithet of Mahēndravarman I, a contemporary of Mādhavavarman IV. See *Matta*, p. 41.
4. Cf. *Manu*, VII, verses 26-27. Cf. also *vidhivad=upachitābhiḥ śaktibhiś=Śakra-kalpaḥ* in the Aihole *praśasti* (EI, VI, p. 6, verse 25).
5. Scholars are unanimous in taking this name as a variation of Vikramēndra.
6. This letter is lost as the plate is broken away here.
7. See Appendix VII.
8. See Appendix VIII.
9. The ring above *stra*, representing the medial sign, is not complete and its end is slightly turned inward, as in the case of *śrī* in line 1 above. R.S. Panchamukhi correctly read *s=Trīvara* only (EI. XXIII, p. 91 and n. 6). Lakshman Rao also seems to read *s=Trīvara* (JDL, XI, p. 59). See also Appendix VIII.
10. Read *Śaury-audārya*. In this compound *raya* may mean 'force', 'velocity'.
11. This side of the plate bears the number *2* in the left margin.
12. The portion starting from *nayam=Auśa-nasam* down to *bhūri-bhūḥ* makes one complete stanza in the *Anushṭubh* metre. Yet, because the author intends to have a *Virōdhābhāsa* in the passage *Vikramād=āpta +++bhāskaraḥ* (see below), and because an instance where a part of a verse making a sentence with the succeeding prose passage is not known, a full-stop is introduced here after *bhāti*. The passage *nayam= Auśanasaṁ+++bhāti* means 'having the political wisdom of Uśanas (*i.e.*, Śukra, the Venus), the strength of Kēśava (*i.e.*, Budha, the Mercury; or Vishṇu) (*and*) the lustre of Indu (*i.e.*, the Moon) (*this Mādhavavarman*) shines (as) the very *urubhās* (*i.e.*, the Sun).' Cf. *Budhaṁ Nārāyaṇaṁ vidyāt* etc. in the *Bōdhāyana-Gṛihya-sūtra*, I, xvi, verse 43. Here evidently the author of the Polamuru plates, like Subandhu, famous for *Ślēshālaṁkāra* wants to compare his hero with the planets. See *Vāsaṇa.*, p. 77.
13. The passage *Vikramād+++bhāskaraḥ* contains *Ślēshālaṁkāra*. For *vi* means sky or bird (*i.e.*, Garuḍa); *krama*=course, or uninterrupted progress; *Vikramā*=valour or Vikramēndravarman; *bhūri-bhū*=the-moon (who has many births) or one having vast earth. The *Vāsavadattā* and *Kādambarī* are noted for similar and more striking puns and consequent *Virōdhābhāsas*. Therefore to dub the language of the Polamuru record as totally "bad" (SS, p. 131, n.) is to overlook the nuance and subtility of the language. The utterly

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

defective passage in the record is in the imprecatory portion.

14. *Ta* is redundent. *Sima* is taken sometimes as a synonym of *sīmā* 'boundary'.
15. Read *prasthitaiḥ+++atitaradbhiḥ*.
16. This letter *ta* originally forgotten is added later in small character below the line.
17. Read *Taittirīya-*
18. Cf. *a-pūrvadattyā* of the Vākāṭaka records (CII, V, pp. 7-8, lines 14-15; pp. 12-13, lines 23-24; etc.); *Sarvasiddhi-dattyā* (No. XVII, line 20); *gaṇadattiḥ* on the seal of Svāmirāja's plates, year 322 (CII, IV, plate facing p. 617). See also Ch. IX, sect. ii, note 110.
19. Read *-gata-*. The same *-śata* occurs in the Polamuru set II also.
20. This side bears the number *3* in the left margin.
21. Read *ājñaptir=atra* etc. See Ch. VI, sect. ii.
22. This verse and the next are not found anywhere else. Hence it is difficult to give a correct version of them precisely.
23. This side of the plate bears the number *4* in the left margin.
24. Read *varsha-*
25. Read either *ākshēptā* or *āchchhēttā*.
26. The numeral *8* is engraved below *40*. Dr. Sircar prefers to read the regnal year of the record as *40* only. But he does not rule out its being *48 i.e., 40[+*]8*. See SS, p. 104, n.; CA, p. 208.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

B—INSCRIPTIONS OF THE FEUDATORIES AND SUCCESSORS OF THE VISHNUKUNDIS

No. XI : GODAVARI PLATES (SET I) OF PṚITHIVĪMŪLA, YEAR 25

This charter, discovered somewhere in the former Godavari District, consists of a set of five copper plates (each measuring about $5\frac{3}{8}''$ by $2\frac{3}{8}''$) and a ring ($\frac{1}{4}''$ in thickness and $3\frac{1}{2}''$ in diameter) with an oval seal ($1''$ by $1\frac{1}{8}''$) with some emblem (destroyed by rust) on the counter-sunk surface. The whole set weighs $77\frac{3}{8}$ *tolas*. The following transcript is based on the facsimiles of the record published in JBBRAS, XVI, between pp. 116 and 117.

TEXT

First Plate, Second Side

1 Siddham[1] Svasti [।*] Vijaya-Kāndāḷi-vāsakāt dēva-dvija-
2 guru-charaṇa-samārādhan-ādhigata-nirati-
3 śaya-puṇyanichayasya sakaḷa-diṅmaṇḍalā-
4 ḷā(ḷa)ṅkārabhūta-yaśasaḥ śrī-Prabhākara-vikhyāta-

Second Plate, First Side

5 mahārājasya sūnuḥ ma(mā)tā-pitṛi-pād-ānuddhyātaḥ
6 śruti-smṛiti-vihita-pad-ārtth-āvabōdha-janita-pra-
7 jñā-vivēka-niravagīt-ānupālītaśēsha[2]-varṇṇāśra-
8 ma-dharmmaḥ par-ānugraha-mātra-prayōjana-pra-

Second Plate, Second Side

9 tipann-aisva(śva)ryya-guru-bhāra[ḥ*] paramamāhēśvaraḥ śrīmān
10 Pri(Pṛi)thivi(vī)mūlā(la)ra(rā)jaḥ Tāḷupāka-vishaya-nivāsinaḥ
11 sarvvān=ēva rāshṭrakūṭa-pramukhān=ēvam=ājñāpa-
12 yati yathā [।*] viditam=astu bhavtām(tāṁ) śrut-ābhija-

Third Plate, First Side

13 na-vṛitta-sampat-prabhā-bhāsur-ōdāra-purusha-ratna-nikara-prasū-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

14 ti-hētu-prakhyāta-Maṇalkuḍi-vāstavya-dvij-ātyanta(nt-ā)chha(chchha)-

15 payōdhi-sambhūta-śītaraśmēr=asakkṛirda(kṛid=a)vāpta-chāturddanta-

16 saṁgrāma-vijayasya [3]Mitavarmmaṇaḥ priya-tanayēna

Third Plate, Second Side

17 sarabhasam=Indrabhaṭṭāraka-samutpātan-ābhilāsha-samudi-

18 ta-pramudit-āśēsha-nṛipati-kkṛi(kṛi)ta-tumula-sama-

19 r-ādhirūḍha-Supratīk-ānēkap-ābhimukha-samada-Kumu-

20 da-dvirada-nipātan-ādhigāta-bhuvanatala-vita[ta]-

Fourth Plate, First Side

21 vipula-viśuddha-yaśasā śrīmad-Indrādhirājēna sva-m[ā]tā-

22 pitrōḥ puṇy-āvāpti-nimitta[ṁ*] vijñāpitēna mayā Viḷēndi-

23 Rēṅguṭa-Karmpaṟ-Ānukūrāṇām chaturṇṇā[ṁ*] grāmāṇā[ṁ*]

24 maddhyē Chūyipākō nāma grāmaḥ Upāddhyāya-kula-sambhū-

Fourth Plate, Second Side

25 tēbhyō nānā-gōtrēbhyas=tri-chatvāriṁśad-Ātharvvaṇika-kuli-

26 bhyō=agrahārīkkṛi(kṛi)tya datta[ḥ ।*] sa sarvvē(rvvai)r=ēva paripālanīyō vi-

27 śēshēṇa hastikōśa-vīrakōśābhyām [।*] api cha [।*] Sva-dattāṁ

28 para-dattāṁ vā yō harēta vasundharām[।*] gavāṁ śata-saha-

29 srasya hantu[ḥ*] pibati kilbisha[m] [॥1*] Shashṭi-varsha-saha-

Fifth Plate, First Side

30 srāṇi svarggē mōdati bhūmida[ḥ ।*] āchchhēttā ch=ānumantā cha tāny=ēva narakē

31 vasēt [॥2*] Tām=ēva rakshatā(tō) yatnāt nibōdhaḥ(dha) kkṛi(kṛi)tinaḥ= phalam [।*] n=aika-kalpa-

32 sahasrāṇī(ṇi) divi dēvai[ḥ*] sa dīvyati [॥3*] Bahubhir=vvasudhā dattāḥ(ttā) bahubhi-

33 ś=ch=ānupālitā [।*] yasya yasya yadā bhūmi[s*]=tasya tasya tadā phalam [॥4*]

34 ājñapti[ḥ*] sva-mukhaṁ(kham) [।*] Pravada(rddha)māna-vijaya-rājya-[4]sa-mvatsarāṇi pañchā-vi[ṁ*]śa[tiḥ*] 20 5

35 Vāsā 4[5] divasam 3 [॥*]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Expressed by a symbol.
2. Better read *vivēk-ānupālita-ñīravagīt-āśēsha-*
3. *Mita* itself can constitute a good name (See SED s.v.). Or it may be a Prākṛitic form of the Skt. *Mitra* (Cf. Kielhorn's Northern List, No. 688; etc.).
4. Read *saṁvatsarāṇi*.
5. It is an ancient Prākṛit form of saying *Varshā-pakshaḥ* in Sanskrit. Fleet read *vāsāka* (JBBRAS, XVI, p. 118). But what he read as *ka* is nothing but a numerical symbol for *4*. Cf. the *ka*-s in other places of the record. Kielhorn (Northern List No. 688) and Dr. D.R. Bhandarkar (Northern List No. 1904) correctly read it as *vāsā 4*. Cf. also Bühler's *Indian Palaeographical Tables*, Tafel IX.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

No. XII : GODAVARI PLATES (SET II) OF PṚITHIVĪMŪLA

This charter, obtained from either of the Godavari Districts, A.P. (the exact findspot is not known) consists of five copper plates (each measuring about 18 cm by 4.5 cm) and a copper ring with a seal that contains on its surface some figures now totally indistinct. The ring and the seal weigh 515 gm and 159 gm respectively the weight of the plates is not known. The following transcript is based on the plates of the record published in APGAS, No. 6, facing pp. 241 ff.

TEXT

First Plate, Second Side[1]

1 Siddham[2] [I*] Jayati Munir=udagra-khyāta-chandrāṁśu-jāla-prachaya-ruchira-kī-

2 rtti-śrīr=ajēyasya yasya [I*] jagad=idam=abhishiktan=dakshiṇ-āmbhō-bhir=u-

3 chchaiḥ kshubhita-salila-nātha-sparddhibhir=Mmāra-sainyaiḥ[3] II [1*] Ta-danu jayati bhū-

4 mṇā Mūlarājas=samantād=vitata-ruchira-bhāsval-lōka-vikhyāta-kīrttiḥ [I*] bahu-

Second Plate, First Side

5 samara-jay-ōpātt-ōnta(nna)ta-śrīr=ajēya[ḥ*] svaka-vara-guṇa-pāś[4]-ābaddha.

6 niśśēsha-lōkaḥ [II 2*]Svasti [I*] Vijaya-Guṇapāśapurāt dēva-dvija-

7 guru-charaṇa-samārādhan-ādhigata-niratiśaya-puṇya-nichaya-

8 sya sakala-didma(ṅ-ma)ṇḍal-ālaṁkārabhūta-yaśasaḥ śrī-Prabhākara-vi-khyāta-

Second Plate, Second Side[5]

9 mahārājasya sūnur=mmātā-pitṛi-pād-ānuddhyataḥ śruti-smṛiti-vihita-

10 pad-ārtth-āvabōdha-janita-prajñā-vivēka-niravagīt-ānupāli-

11 t-āśēsha[6]-varṇṇāśrama-dharmmaḥ par-ānugraha-mātra-prayōjana-

12 pratipann-aiśvaryya-guru-bhāraḥ anēka-chāturddanta-samara-saṁghaṭṭa-vi-

Third Plate, First Side

13 jayī satata-gō-bhūmi-hiraṇya-kanyā-pradān-ādibhis=saphalīkṛita-jīvit-ōpa-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

14 bhōgaḥ parama-māhēśvaraḥ parama-brahmaṇyaḥ dharmma-vijayī śrīmān Pri(Pṛi)thivīśrī-

15 mūlarājaḥ Tāḷupāka-vishayē rāshṭrakūṭa-grāmavṛiddha-pramukha-vishaya-

16 nivāsinaḥ sarvvān=ittham=ājñāpayati yathā [।*] viditam=astu bhavatām= asakṛid=anēka-

17 niśita-[ni]str[i]ṁśa-[sa]ha[sra]-saṁkul-ātibhīma-saṁgrāma-bhūmi-prakāśit-ātma-vikram-ātiśa-

Third Plate, Second Side[7]

18 y-ōpārjjita-yaśō-vibhūti-vistarāya mama priya-tanayāya Harivarmma-rājā-

19 ya śrī-Konṟaḷagganṟu Pariyapaṟu Truḷpaṟu ity=ēshāṁ grāmāṇāṁ maddhya-gataḥ

20 Kaṭṭucheṟuvul=nāma grāmō mayā dattaḥ [।*] anēna cha mad-anumatēna Hari-

21 varmma-rājēna mahāvihāra-nivāsinaṁ navakarmma-vyāpār-ādhikṛitam= anumatya

Fourth Plate, First Side

22 Guṇapāśapura-giriataṭ[ē] sva-pratishṭhāpita-mahāvihāra-nivāsy-āgat-ānā-

23 gata-chāturddiś-āryya-vara-bhikshu-saṅgha-chatushpratyaya-paribhōg-ārttha-

24 n=dattas=sarvva-parihārēṇa [।*] sa sarvvair=ēva rāja-ṛishibhiḥ śruti-smṛiti-vihi-

25 ta-sadāchār-ānuvarttibhis=samyak=paripālanīyaḥ [।*] bhavanti ch=ātra Mata(nu)-gī-

Fourth Plate, Second Side

26 tā[ḥ*] ślōkāḥ [।*] Bahubhir=vvasudhā dattā bahubhiś=ch=ānupālitā [।*] yasya

27 yasya yadā bhūmis=tasya tasya tadā phalaṁ(lam) [॥3*] Bhūmi-dānāt= paran=dā-

28 nan=na bhūtan=na bhavishyati[।*]tasy=aiva haraṇāt=pāpan=na bhūtan= =na bhavi-

29 shyati [॥4*] Shashṭi[i*]ṁ varsha-sahasrāṇi svarggē tishṭhati bhūmidaḥ [।*] āchchhēttā ch=ānumantā cha tāny=ēva

Fifth Plate, First Side

30 narakē vasēt [॥5*] yaś=ch=ātra lōbh-ērshyā-pramād-ājñāna-kshudra-parivāra-dōsha-vaśāt dharmma-vi-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

31 [lō]pāya pravarttēta sa imāni pātakāni spṛiśēt || Nigghnatāṁ bhartṛi-gō-vipra-bā-

32 [la]-yōshit-tapasviṇaḥ [|*] yā gatis=sā bhavēd=vṛittiṁ harata[ḥ*] śāsan-āṅkitām [||6*] Sva-dattāṁ para-

33 [da]ttāṁ vā yō harēta vasundharām [|*] sa vishṭhāyāṁ krimi[r*]=bhūtvā pitṛibhis=saha pachyatē ||[7*] Siddham[8]||

Fifth Plate, Second Side[9]

34 [U]ddiśya Tāmbraparṇṇīyāt(yān) śāsana[ṁ] Harivarmmaṇā [|*] rājñā kṛitam=iha sthēyā-

35 d=idam=ā-chandra-tārakaṁ(kam) ||[8*] Siddham[8]||

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. This side of the plate bears the number *1* engraved in the margin.
2. Expressed by a symbol.
3. Construe *sainyaiḥ* with *ajēyasya*. This verse and the next are in *Mālinī* metre.
4. Here there is an indirect reference to the place of issue of the charter, *viz.*, Guṇa-pāśa.
5. This side of the plate bears the number *2* engraved in the margin.
6. Better read *-vivēk-ānupālita-niravagit-āśēsha-*
7. In this plate as well as in the succeeding one no trace of numeral is visible.
8. Expressed by a symbol.
9. This side seems to bear number *5* in the margin.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

NO. XIII : JIRJINGI PLATES OF THE GAṄGA INDRAVARMAN I, YEAR 39

This charter, unearthed in the village Jirjiṅgi (near Tekkali, Srikakulam District, A.P.) consists of a set of three copper plates (each measuring about $8\frac{1}{4}''$ by $3''$) and a copper ring ($3''$ in diameter). The seal is missing. The weight of the plates and the ring is 69 *tolas*. The following transcript is based on the plates of the record published in JAHRS, III, pp. 51 ff., and EI, XXV, facing p. 286.

TEXT

First Plate, Second Side

1 Siddham[1] Svasti [l*] Amarapura-pratisparddhi-śrīmad-Dantapurād=bhagavatas=sakala-bhu-

2 vana-tal-ōtpatti-sthiti-pralaya-hētōḥ Paramēśvarasya satata-praṇā-

3 m-āvāptaḥ(pta)-puṇya-sañchaya-prabhāva-nirast-āśēsha-duritō Gāṅg-āmala-kula-

4 gagana-tala-sahasraraśmiḥ anēka-chāturddanta-samara-vijaya-

5 vimala-vikōśa-nistriṅśa[2]-dhārā-samākrānta-sakala-sāmanta-

6 nṛipati-maṇḍal-ādhipatiḥ(ti)-makuṭa-nihita-ruchira-padmarāga-

7 prabhā-prasēka-parishvaṅga-piṅg-āṅgīkṛita-charaṇa-yugalaḥ

Second Plate, First Side

8 atula-bala-samuday-āvāpta-vipula-vibhava-saṁpal-la[tā]-

9 maṇḍapa-chchhāyā-viśrānta[ḥ](nta)-suhṛit-sādhu-vā(bā)ndhav-ārtthi-janaḥ

10 mātā-pitṛi-pād-ānuddyātas=Trikaliṅg-ādhipati[ḥ] śrī-mahā-

11 rāj-Ēndravarmmā [3] Vōṅkhārabhōga-saṁ(sa)mbaddha-Jijjika-grāmē

12 sarvva-samavētān=kuṭumbina[ḥ*] samājñāpayaty=asty=ayaṁ grāmō=

13 smābhir=Vvishṇuvṛiddha-sagōttrāya Ttai(Tai)ttirīya-savra(bra)hmachāriṇē

Second Plate, Second Side

14 Rudrasvāmi-sūnavē Agnisvāminē tat-tanujāya cha Rudrasvāminē

15 saṁvibhajy=ārddhēn=ā-samudr-ādri-śaśi- tārak-ārkka-pratishṭham=aggrahāraṁ kṛitvā

16 sva-puṇy-āyū(yu)r-yyaśō-va(ba)la-varddhanārttha[ṁ*] mātā-pitrōś=cha puṇy-āvāpta-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

17 yē [cha] sarvva-kara-parihāraiḥ parihṛitya ch=āyaṁ grāmaḥ

18 prattaḥ [|*] tad=ēvaṁ bhavadbhiḥ pūrvv-ōchita-maryyāday=ōpasthēyam [|*]

19 bhavishyataś=cha rājñō vijñāpayāmi | [4]dharmma-krama-vikramā-

Third Plate, First Side

20 ṇām=anyatama-yōgād=avāpta-bhūmaṇḍal-ādhirājyair=ap=īmā[ṁ*]

21 mahīm=anuśāsadbhih·=kram-āgataṁ dānamī(m=i)ty=anupālanīyam ||

22 api cha ślōkau bhavataḥ || Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ mvā(va) yatnād=raksha

23 Yudhishṭhira [|*] mahī[ṁ*] mahimatāṁ śrēshṭha |[3] dānāch=chhrēyō=nupā-lanaṁ(nam) [||1*]

24 Shashṭiṁ varsha-sahasrāṇi svarggē mōdati bhūmida[ḥ*] | āchchhēttā ch= ānuma-

25 ntā cha tany=ēva narakē vasēt [||2*] Pravarddhamāna-saṁ 39[5] Vaiśākha-di 20 | ||

26 Likhitam=idaṁ mahārājñō[6] sāndhivigrahika-[7]Dēvasiṅgha dēvēn=ēti ||

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Expressed by a symbol.
2. Read *-nistriṁśa-*
3. This punctuation mark is unnecessary.
4. See above Ch. IX, n. 92.
5. R. Subba Rao originally read the year of the record as *309* (JAHRS, III, pp. 50, 53). But he subsequently corrected his reading (ibid., correction slip facing title page). Dr. Sircar read the year as *30*[+*] *9* (ibid., VII, pp. 229-30). R.K. Ghoshal approved this reading (EI, XXV, p. 288). But there is no doubt that the first figure here is *3* and it is identical with the last figure of the date portion of the Chicacole plates of Guṇārṇava's son Dēvēndravarman (EI, III, plate facing p. 133) and the date of the record has been correctly read by Hultzsch as *100 83* (EI, XVIII, p. 308). It is also identical with the second figure that is found both in the Purle Plates of Dānārṇava's son Indravarman (EI, XIV, plate facing p. 362) and the Chicacole plates of Indravarman (IA, XIII, plate facing p. 123) whose dates have been read as *100 37* and *100 38* respectively by Hultzsch (EI, XVIII, p. 308). Therefore the first figure in the present record seems to be a decimal figure *3* rather than a numerical symbol for *30*. And hence the date may be read as *39* rather than as *30 9*.
6. Read *mahārājasya*.
7. Read *Dēvasiṁha-*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

NO. XIV : TĀṆḌIVĀḌA GRANT OF PṚITHIVĪMAHĀRĀJA, YEAR 46

This charter, the findspot of which is not known, consists of a set of four copper plates (each measuring 6⅛″ by 2″) and with a ring hole, about ½″ in diameter. No information is available about the ring and the seal. The weight of the complete set is not known, though the first three plates seem to have weighed about 26½ *tolas*. The following transcript is based on the plates of the record published in EI, XXIII, between pp. 96-97 and JOR, Vol. IX, between pp. 192-93.

TEXT

First Plate, Second Side

1 Svasti [I*] Śrīmat-Pishṭapurāt=sakala-jagad-avana-samudbhūta-kīrtti-
2 chāru-chandrikā-samu[d*]dyōtita-digantarasya ma-
3 hārāja-Raṇadurjjayasya sūnōs=samati-
4 śayita-Śakra-vibhūtēr=Vvikramēndrasya priya-tanayaḥ

Second Plate, First Side

5 pravarddhamāna-pratāp-ōpanata-samasta-sāmanta-maṇḍala[ḥ*] nija-
6 bhuja-vijay-ōday-ādhigata-yaśō-viśēsha-bhūshaṇaḥ śrī-R[ā*]ma-
7 kāśyapa-sagōtraḥ parama-brahmaṇyō mātā-pitṛi-pā-
8 d-ānuddhyātaḥ śrī-Pṛithivīmahārājaḥ Pāguṇāra-vi[sha]yē Tāṇḍi-
9 vāḍa-grāmam=adhivassa(sa)ta[ḥ*] sarvva-samavētān=kuṭi(ṭu)mbinas= samajñāpa-

Second Plate, Second Side

10 yati yathā I śruti-mmṛi(smṛi)ti-pāradṛiśvanaḥ yathāvad-anushṭhit-Āgna(gni)-shṭō-
11 m-ādi-kriyā-pūt-ātmanō Vishṇuśarmmaṇaḥ pu(pau)trāya asakṛid-ijyā-
12 prayōga-parāyamāṇa-draviṇa-sūchita-rtvi[k][1]-sa-
13 dasya-samṛiddhē[ḥ] Trisahasravidy-ādhyayana-pravachana-vyākhyāna-
14 śīlinaḥ Pri(Pṛi)thivīśarmmaṇaḥ putrāya vēda-vēdāṅga-nyāy-ōpa-

Third Plate, First Side

15 nishad-yōg-[ā*]vabōdha-nirmmalīkṛita-buddhayē vividh-ādhvar-āvabhṛith-ā-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

16 mbhaḥ-pavitrīkṛita-vigrahāya dēva-pitṛi-manushya-samarchana-

17 samānīta-rātrin-divāya Koṇḍamañchi-grāma-nivāsinē

18 Trisahasravidyāya Viṁśati-vyākhyānāya Kāmakāyana-sa-

19 gōtrāya Chhandōga-sabrahmachāriṇē Bhavaśarmmaṇē asmad-āyu-

Third Plate, Second Side

20 r-ārā(rō)gya-yaśō-bhivṛiddhayē sarvva-kara-parihārēṇ=āgrā(gra)hārī-

21 kṛitya grāmō=yan=dattaḥ [I*] na kaiśchid=api bādhā karaṇīyā [I*] pra-

22 [va*]rddhamāna-vijaya-rājya-saṁvatsarē shaṭ-chatvāriṁśē

23 Kārttika-Paurṇṇamāsyān=dharmma-pradānam=ētat [I*] ājñapti[ḥ*] śrī-Rāma-

24 lēṇṛurājaḥ [I*] atra Vyāsa-gītā[ḥ*] ślōkāḥ [I*] Bahubhir=vvasudhā dattā

Fourth Plate, First Side

25 bahubhiś=ch=ānupālitā [I*] yasya yasya yadā bhūmi[s]= tasya tasya

26 tadā phalam [‖1*] Sva-dattāṁ para-dattā[ṁ*] vā yatnād=raksha Yudhi-shṭhira I

27 mahīṁ mahimatāṁ śrēshṭha dharmmāch=chhrēyō=nupālanaṁ(nam) [‖2*]

28 Āsph ā(sphō)ṭa yanti pitarō valganti prapitāmahāḥ I

29 bhumidātā kulē jātaḥ I[2] sa nas=trātā bhavishyati ‖[3*]

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. The superscript *k* originally forgotten is added later in tiny character.
2. This punctuation mark is superfluous.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

NO. XV : GOLLĀVALLI GRANT OF PṚTHIVĪMAHĀRĀJA, YEAR 49

This charter, the findspot of which is also not known, consists of three copper plates of which the right half of the third plate is broken away and lost. The first and second plates measure about 7.5″ by 2.3″ each while the broken third plate measures now about 3.7″ by 2.3.″ No ring or seal is available. The three plates together weigh about 31 *tolas*. The following is the transcript based on the plates of the record published in the *Inscriptions of Orissa*, I, pt., ii, pp. 54 ff and in EI, XXXV, between pp. 222-23.

TEXT

First Plate, Second Side

1 Svasti [।*] Śrī-vijayaskandhāvārāt Virajōnagar-ādhivāsakāt=sakala-jagad-
avana-samudbhū-

2 [ta]-kīrtti-chāru-chandrikā-samud[d*]yōtita-digantarasya mahārāja-Raṇadu-
rjjayasya

3 sūnōs=samatiśayita-Śakra-vibhūtēr=Vvikramēndrasya priya-tana-

4 yaḥ pravarddhamāna-pratāp-ōpanata-samasta-sāmanta-maṇḍalaḥ nija-

5 bhuja-vijaya-ōday-ādhigata-yaśō-viśēsha-bhūshaṇaḥ śrī-Rā[ma]-

Second Plate, First Side

6 kāśyapa-sagōtraḥ parama-brahmaṇyō mātā-pitṛi-pād-ānuddhyāta[ḥ] śrī-
Pṛi[thi]vī-

7 mahārā[jaḥ] K[u]drāvaḷi-vishayē Gollāvalli-grāmam=adhivāsina[ḥ*] sarvva-
sa-

8 mavētān=kuṭumbinaḥ samājñāpayati yathā [।*] Mātṛi-śarmmaṇaḥ pautrā-

9 ya Dā[mō]daraśarmmaṇah=putrāya Vēda-vēd[ā*]ṅga-p[ā]ragāya shaṭ-
karmmanira-

10 tāya yama-niyama-parāyaṇāya Purāṇa-Rāmāyaṇa-Dharmmaśāstr-[ā]-

Second Plate, Second Side

11 dy-ānēka-vidyā-pāradaśa(rśi)nē Bhṛigu-sagōtrāya Taittirīya-[sa]brahmachā-
riṇē

12 Padmaśarmmaṇē grāmō=yam=asmat-puṇy-āyur-ārōgya-jaya-ya[śōbhivṛi-
ddha]yē

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

13 sarvva-kara-parihārēṇ=āgrahārīkṛitya dattaḥ [l*] na kaiśchid=api [bā]dhā ka-

14 raṇ[ī*]yā [l*] Pravarddhamāna-vijaya-rājya-saṁvatsarē nav-ādhika-chatvā-riṁśē

15 Jaishṭa(Jyēshṭha)-māsa-śukla-paksh-āshṭamyāṁ dharmma-prādō(dā)nam= ētadā(t l ā)jñaptiḥ śrī-Rāma-

Third Plate, First Side

16 lēnṛurājaḥ [l*] atra Vyāsa-gītāḥ ślōk[āḥ][1] . . . . .

17 bihś=ch=ānupālitā [l*] yasya . . .

18 tadā phalaṁ(lam ‖ l) Āsphā(sphō)ṭayanti . . .

19 bhūmi-jā(dā)tā kulē jātas=sa nas=trātā bhavi . . . . . .

20 mōdati bhūmida[ḥ l*] ākshēptā ch=ānuman[tā][2] . . . . . .

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Right half of the plate is broken away and lost.
2. The rest is lost.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

NO. XVI : MĀRUṬŪRA GRANT OF [PULAKĒŚI II], YEAR 8

The findspot as well as the present whereabouts of the originals of this charter are not known. Photographs alone are stated to be preserved in the Office of the Department of Archaeology, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad. This is a set of five copper plates (each measuring 6″ by 2″) with a ring hole about 0.4″ in diameter in the left side of the plate. Other details regarding the set are not known. The subjoined transcript is based on the plates of the charter published in APGAS, No. 6, facing pp. 36 ff.

TEXT

First Plate, Second Side

1 Svasti[1] [||*] Svāmi-Mahāsēna-pād-ānudhyātānāṁ Mānavyasagōttrāṇāṁ Hā r[iti-pu]ttrāṇāṁ Cha[lu*]kya(kyā)[nāṁ*] kula-

2 vipula-nabhastal-ākkrānta-guṇa-gabhasti-māl-ālaṁkri(kṛi)ta-bhāskara[ḥ] Satyāśraya-śrī-pri(pṛi)thivi(vī)-

3 vallabha-mahārājaḥ mātā-pitṛi-pād-ānuddhyātō ripu-jana-mṛiga-kula-

4 bhaya-janana-vāhana-varacharaṇachār- āmalanayana- śauryya-ōgra-daṁshṭra-pratā-

5 pa-vīryya-vēg-ōdyata-nṛipati-siṅgaḥ(siṁhaḥ)[2] siṅga(siṁha)vikkrāntaḥ[3] svabāhu-bala-sāmartthy-ō-

Second Plate, First Side

6 pārjjita-rājya-sampannaḥ[4] naya-vinaya-vijñāna-dāna-dayā-dākshiṇya-

7 mati-bal-ōtsāha-dhairyya-sthairyya-mādhuryya-gāmbhīryya-vīryya-tyāga-[parama]brahma-

8 ṇyat-ādir=anēka[5]-guṇa-gaṇ-ālaṁkṛita-śarīraḥ kṛittī(t-ti)lakabhūtaḥ[6] sukṛitānāṁ

9 smarttā dushkṛitānāṁ vismarttā nirupahata-pañchēndriya-śarīraḥ pavana-bala-

10 chalit-ōttuṅga-bhaṅga-taraṅg-[ā]valī-sahasr-ākīrṇṇa-jalanidhi-valay-ātikrānta-

Second Plate, Second Side

11 ripu-maṇḍala-vijaya-labda(bdha)-ś[ā]rad-āmala-śaśalāchchha(ñchha)na-marichī(rīchi)-saṁ[hati]-dhava-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

12 ḷa-chchhāy-ōpahasita-yaś[āḥ ।*] Babhau sa Chai(Vai)nya-pratimāna-ki(kī)-
rttis=tamaḥ pramṛidna-

13 [t=sva]-guṇāṁśu-jālaiḥ[7] [॥*] sa rājā pravarddhamāna-rājya-vijaya-śrī-
varshē=shṭamē Pishṭa-

14 pura-kadāna-grahaṇa-ānantaryyēṇaḥ(ṇa) Kalūrapura-vastitēna[8] Jyēshṭa-
(shṭha)-māsā(sa)sy=Āmā-

15 [vāsyāṁ][9] Sūryya-grahaṇ[ē] Sāvitri(trī)-Suvarchchal-Ārundhati(tī)-Svāhā-
Śachī-sama-śau(sau)śīlya[10]-

Third Plate, First Side

16 naya- vinaya-dāna-sadvṛitt-ādar-ādir-anēka[11]-sadguṇair=apahṛita-manaska-
(skā)[yāḥ*] Ka-

17 damba(mbā)-nāmadhēy-āgr[i]ma-mahādēvya[ḥ*] sva-guru-samutarttha[12]-
sa[ṁ]kalpa-siddhi-samṛi-

18 ddhim=upakurvvatānyach=cha[13] mad-arttha[ṁ] ya[ḥ*] sva-vishya-ōpabō-
(bhō)ga-rakshaṇa-vidhi-

19 vidhānāny=apah[ā*]ya vishamatara[14]-vikṛishṭ[15]-ādhvāna[16]-pravāsa-pratyādā-
[n-ādi]-

20 [17]duḥkhānagaṇayan=Maṅgalasu(pu)rād=āgamya Kalūr[ā*]d=dēvatvam=
upagatas[18]=tasy=Ālu-

Third Plate, Second Side

21 ka-mahārājasy=ākshayya-phalō[19] bhavatv=ayaṁ(ya)m=iti Vāsishṭa(shṭha)-
sagōtra-chatur-vvē-

22 da-vidābhyāṁ[20] Jyēshṭha-Koṇḍa-Bhīmasvāmibhyāṁ chatur-vvēdavidi(dē)
Bhāradvāja-sagōtrāya

23 [Janna]svāminē Bharadvāja-sagōtra eva[21] chatur-vvēdavidi(dē)

24 [.][22]ṇḍaraṅgasvāminē Gautama-sagōtraya(y=ā)śītitārkkakā[ya*][23] Divāka-
rasvā-

25 [minē] [Ā]gnivēśya-sagōtrāy=āśītitārkkakāya Bhō[ṛu][24]svāminē

Fourth Plate, First Side

26 Kāśyā(śya)pa-sagōtrāy=āśītitārkkakāya Rēvasvāminē Bhāradvāja-

27 sagōtr[ā][ya*] gṛihītasāhasrāya Jannasvāminē Kauśika-sa-

28 gōtrāya sahasrā-tārkkakāya[25] Ādittyasvāminē Bhāradvā-

29 ja-sagōtra(trā)[ya*] sahasra-tārkkakāya Vishṇusvāminē Vāsishṭa(shṭha)-
sagōtrāya

30 . .[26] svāminē Kāśyapa-sagōtra-varṇṇa-traya-nivṛittāya Gō[pa]-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Fourth Plate, Second Side

31 śvā(svā)minē cha Natāva[ṭa][27]-Vattippaṛuva-sahitya(ta)-Māruṭūran-nāma-grāmam=agrahāra-

32 bhōga-nyāyēna dattavān | ukta[ṁ*] hi Mānavē dharmma-śāstrō(trē |) Ba-

33 hubhir=vvasudhā bhuktā rājabhis=Sagar-ādibhiḥ [|*]

34 yasya yasya yadā bhūmiḥ tasya tasya tadā phalam [||2*]

35 Shashṭi-varsha-sahasrāṇi svarggē mōdati bhūmidaḥ [|*]

Fifth Plate, First Side

36 āchchhēttā ch=ānumantā cha tāny=ēva nara-

37 kē vasēt [||3*] Svan=dātu[ṁ] sumahach=chhakyaṁ

38 duh·kham=anyatra(sya) pālana[m |*] dānaṁ vā

39 pālanaṁ v=ēti dānāch=chhrēyō=nu-

40 pālanami(m ||4 i)ti ||[28]

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. This auspicious word is engraved in the margin against line 3.
2. *Udyata, i.e., udyama.* Maṅgalēśa is also endowed with the same epithet in his Mahākūṭa pillar inscription. In the last mentioned record, the reading *ripu-jana-mukha-kula-bhaya-jāta-saṁdāha-tatpara-chara-sēvak- āmala- nayana- Śauryy- ōgra- hasta-pratāpa - vīryya- vēgōddhṛita - nṛipa-siṁghaḥ* (IA, XIX, p. 17, lines 9-10) is not supported by the facsimile (see ibid., plate facing p. 18).
3. Cf. *Siṁhavikramaḥ*, an epithet of Maṅgalēśa in his Nerur plates (IA, VII, p. 161, line 9)
4. Cf. *sva-bāhu-bala-parākram-ōpājjita-rājya-saṁpannaḥ*, epithet of Kīrttivarman in the Mahākūṭa pillar inscription, line 6.
5. Read *-ṇyat-ādy-anēka-*
6. In the Mahākūṭa pillar inscription (line 11) an epithet of Maṅgalēśa reads *kutti(ti)lakabhūtaḥ.*
7. This hemistitch of a verse probably in *Upēndravajrā* metre is found also at the end of Maṅgalēśa's description in his Nerur plates (IA, VII, p. 161, lines 11-12). Cf. also *Ven-ābhivijayō* 'victorious like Vainya', an epithet of Khāravēla in the Hathigumpha inscription (*S. Ins.* p. 214, line 2) and *Vainya iva chāpa-kōṭi-samutsārit-ārāti-kulāchalō rājā Śūdrakō nāma* in *Kāda.*, p. 9.
8. The intending reading is *°pura-kadana+++pur-āvasthitō.* See above Ch. VIII, n. 2.
9. *I.e., -Āmāvāsyāyāṁ.* Cf. the commentaries under *Nāma.*, I, iv, verse 8.
10. Cf. *Madayant=īva mahāpativratāṁ*, a description of Durlabhadevī in the Mahākūṭa pillar inscr. lines 12-13. Madayantī as well as Sāvitrī etc., of the present list are legendary characters noted for their chastity. See *Rāma.*, V, xxiv, verses 10 ff.
11. Read *-ādy-anēka-*
12. Gramatically *-saṁmud-arttha-*
13. Read *upakurvvann=anyach=cha*
14. *Vishamatara* 'highly dangerous *or* impassable'.
15. *Vikṛishṭa* 'robbed *or* plundered'.
16. It may be noted that the Telugu *adhvānamu*, Kannaḍa *adhvāna*, Tamil *attuvānam*, all probably from the Skt. *a-dhvāna* 'devoid of any sound' are used in the sense of 'desolate place'.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

17. Read *duḥkhāny=agaṇa°*. *Pravāsa* and *pratyādāna* seem to be used respectively in the sense of 'travelling or dwelling in a foreign country' and 'returning back'.
18. I.e., *Kallūrē saṁyudhya dēvatvam=upagataḥ*. See above Ch. VIII, n. 2.
19. This compound is a *Bahuvrīhi* qualifying the following word *ayaṁ* 'this grant'.
20. *Vidābhyām i. e. vidbhyāṁ*.
21. Read *-sagōtrāy=aiva*
22. This letter has not come out in the facsimile. This name has been read as Pāṇḍaraṅga (APGAS. No. 6, p. 38).
23. *Aśīti-tārkkakāya* (=*tarkā ēva tārkāḥ; aśītiḥ tārkkā yasya tasmai*) may be the same as *aśīti-tarkāya* of other inscriptions (IA, XIII, p. 138, line 22). See Ch. X, sect. ii.
24. This letter is certainly not *ja* as read by some writers (APGAS, No. 6, p. 38).
25. Read *sahasra-tārkkakāya*. Cf. note 23 above.
26. Some scholars read *Vāmasvāminē* here (APGAS, No. 6, p. 39).
27. This name is engraved in small characters below *svāminē* of the line.
28. After this, there are some floral designs. Below the line the expression [*bhōda ? (bādhā)*]-*parihāraṁ* is found engraved in small characters.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

NO. XVII : POLAMURU PLATES (SET II) OF THE EASTERN CHĀLUKYA JAYASIṂHA I, YEAR 5

This charter, discovered in the village Polamuru (Ramachandrapuram Taluk, East Godavari District, A.P.) consists of a set of three plates, (each measuring about 6″ by 2″) and a copper ring (.25″ in thickness) in oval shape (3.12″ by 2.75″) with a circular seal (1.5″ in diameter) slightly broken and completely worn out. The following transcript is based on the plate of the charter published in EI, XIX, facing p. 256 and JAHRS, IV, pp. 74 ff.

TEXT

First Plate, Second Side[1]

1 Svasti [I*] Śrī-Vijayaskandhāvārāt Mātṛi-gaṇa-parirakshitānāṁ Mānavya-sagōtrāṇāṁ

2 Hāritī-putrāṇām Aśvamēdha-yājināṁ Chalukyānāṁ kula-jalanidhi-

3 samutpanna-rājaratnasya sakala-bhuvana-maṇḍala-maṇḍita-kīrttiḥ(rttēḥ) śrī-

4 Kīrttivarmmaṇaḥ pautraḥ anēka-samara-saṁghaṭṭa-vijayinaḥ para-nara-

5 pati-makuṭa-maṇi-mayūkh-āvadāta-charaṇa-yugalasya śrī-Vishṇuvarddhana-

6 mahārājasya priya-tanayaḥ pravarddhamāna-pratāp-ōpanata-samasta-

Second Plate, First Side

7 sāmanta-maṇḍalaḥ sva-bāhu-bala-parākram-ōpārjjita-sa[kala]-yaśō-

8 vibhāsita-digantaraḥ[2] sva-śakti-traya-triśūl-āvabhinna-para-narapati-

9 sakala-bala-chētanaḥ Bṛihaspatir=iva nayajñō Manur=iva vinaya-

10 jñaḥ Yudhishṭhira iva dharmma-parāyaṇaḥ Arjunavad=apara-nara-

11 patibhir=an-abhilaṁghita-paurushyaḥ anēka-śāstrārttha-tatva(ttva)jñaḥ para-

12 ma-brahmaṇyō mātā-pitṛi-pād-ānudhyātaḥ śrī-Pri(Pṛi)thivī-Jayasiṁgha(siṁha)-va-

Second Plate, Second Side[3]

13 llabha-mahārājaḥ Guddavādi-vishayē vishaya-mahattarā[n=a]dhikārapu-

14 rushāṁś=cha imam=arttham=ajñāpayaty=asti viditam=astu vō yath=āsmābhiḥ

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

15 Guddavādi-vishayē Pulōṁbūra-nāma-grāmaḥ vēda-vēdāṁga-

16 vidō Dāmaśarmmaṇaḥ pautrāya sva-pitur=adhika-guṇa-gaṇ-ādhi-

17 vāsasya Śivaśarmmaṇaḥ putrāya Taittirīka-sabrahmachāriṇē vēda-

18 dvay-ālaṁk[ṛi]ta-śari(rī)rāya Gautama-sagōtrāya sva-karmm-ānu[shṭhā]na-

Third Plate, First Side[4]

19 parāya pūrvv-agrahārika-Rudraśarmmaṇē Asanapura-sthāna-vāstavyāya

20 śrī-Sarvvasiddhi-datyā(ttyā) sarvva-kara-parihārēṇ=āgrahārīkṛitya sampra-
ttaḥ[।*]

21 tathā bhavadbhir=anyaiś=cha dharmm-ādhiśata[5]-buddhibhiḥ paripālanīyaḥ
[।*]

22 na-kaiśchid=bādhā karaṇīyā [।*] ājñapitr=atra hastikōśa-virakōśayō[ḥ ।*]

23 [Vyā*]sa-gītāḥ । Bahubhir=vvasudhā dattā bhahubhiś=ch=ānupālitā [।*]
yasya yasya

24. yadā bhūmis=tasya tasya tadā phalami(m ‖ 1 ‖ i) ti । Saṁ ‖ 5 । Gi 8 । di 3[6] [‖*]

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. This side of the plate bears the No. *1* engraved in the left margin.
2. Better read *-ōpārjita-yaśō-vibhāsita-sakala-dig-antaraḥ.*
3. This side of the plate bears the No. *2* in the margin.
4. This side of the plate bears the No. *3* in the margin.
5. See No. X, line 28 and the note thereunder.
6. The date of the record has been differently read by scholars. Some writers read (ARE, 1914, App. A, No. 5) the date portion as *[1]5, [Śu] di 6, [Sunday]*, while others preferred to read it as *5 gi(grī)8 di 7* (JAHRS, V, p. 183). However the reading *Saṁ ‖ 5 । Gi 8 । di 3* seems to be the correct one (SS, p. 342). Here *saṁ* stands for *saṁvatsara, Gi* for *Giṁha* (=Skt. *Grīshma*) and *di* for *dina.*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

NO. XVIII : CHEZERLA STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF MAHĒNDRAVIKRAMAMAHĀRĀJA AND PṚITHIVĪYUVARĀJA

This highly damaged inscription consisting of 94 lines is engraved on two sides of a stone slab set up behind the *Nandi-maṇḍapa* in front of the central shrine in the Kapōtēśvara temple at Chēzerla, Narasaraopet Taluk, Guntur District, A.P. The inscribed portion occupies an area about 62″ by 15″ on the first face and 45″ by 15.5″ on the second The following transcript is based on the photographs supplied by the Chief Epigraphist, on the personal examination of the record *in situ* and on the transcript published in SII, VI, Nos 594-95. This record is also partly published in EHAC, pp. 198-99 and JAHRS, XI, p. 50.

TEXT

First Face

1 [1]K[ō]lissarasaḥ[2] nīra-kētōḥ sva-śakti-śātita-
2 śātrava-kari-vara-ghaṭā-saṁkaṭa-Dhānyakaṭa-raṇa-
3 sapta-kōṭēḥ prathitāt=[3]Pṛithivīyuvarājaḥ[4] ā-
4 nanda-kār-Ānanda-maharshi-mahā-gōtra-viyad-amala-
5 sakala-tuhinakiraṇasya [5]samavagāḍh-Āndhra-sundarī-
6 chandan-āñjan-ālaktaka-lōla-mālā-parimōsha-pa-
7 richaya-kṛit-āparādha-vaipulya-sitētara-Bēṇṇā-
8 nāthasya Trikūṭaparvvata-patēr=ggōlāṅgūla-vija-
9 ya-kētanasya hallīsa-paṭu-paṭaha-rava-sa . .
10 mapya(?) . .[sv-ōdyō]gasya Kandarapura-vara-janapada-dvitay-ā-
11 dhipatēḥ Kandararājasya priya-sutāyām=Avanitalā-
12 ntavatyām[5a] =mahādēvyāṁ sa[ñjā]tas=sadgurōs=tasy=āspada-
13 m=adhishṭhēya-guṇam=adhitishṭhann=alaṁkurvvāṇaḥ sujātaḥ
14 [su]jana-manaḥ-śravaṇa-sukha-charita-bhājanō [6]janōdita-
15 sakala-yaśō-viśēshaḥ Śēsha-sthira-vṛitt-ā-jānu-karaḥ
16 [ka]ri-[gha]ṭā-viśasta-śātrava-śarīra-śakala-mālā-maṇḍa-
17 na-[bhâ]vyamāna-parēta-kaṇṭha-guṇō guṇ-ōnnati-virōdhi-
18 para-jan-augha-nivāraṇō vāraṇ-ōttama-balō bal-ōnnatas=sa-
19 ... [7]Kusumakētur=abalājana-manaḥ-pramathana-paṭur=

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

20 a-kalpatarur=abhilashita-phala-pradāna-kṛita-matir=a-Himagi-
21 rir=an-atilaṁghanīya-mahima-gurur=a-salila-nidhir=agādha-
22 gāṁbhīryya-dhairyya-ślāghī sa-Garuḍa-Muraripu-sanātha-śāsanaḥ
23 parama-samṛiddha-pallī-janapad-ādhipatir=ati-bala-jaya-matiḥ
24 sima-samaya[8]-samunnata-gṛiddhr-āddhyāsita-kētanaḥ prati-nṛipa-
25 t[i]-vanitā-śruti-patha-śrōtrābharaṇa-gaurava-vaiphalya-
26 .....karō vārinātha-ghōshaṇas=samara-paṭu-
27 paṭaha-rava-śravaṇa-dviguṇa-mada-guṇa(ṇō) guṇa-sāgara-ska-
28 .....vijaya[ḥ] sujan-ānuraktō=nurāga-gurur=abhi-
29 [shṭu]ta-guṇ-āvāsas=sakala-kalā-viśārada[9]-sat-sabhā-mallaḥ
30 [sva-ku]la-salilanidhi-samabhivarddhana-tuhinakara(rō) nara-tilaka-
31 ....dushṭa-nigrah-ōgra-vish-āghātaḥ śishṭa-paripālana-
32 ....pra[sa]nna-nṛipa-vara-guṇō=tulya-kāntiḥ śrīmān=śrī-
33 [Ra]ṇamah[ā]vikra[ma]ḥ[10] [I*] sa sva-[s]ut-ānvayasya pṛithu-jaya-bal-ā-
34 [yu]r-ārōgy-ābhilashitārtha-siddhi-vṛiddhayē punar=atra tīrttha-
35 ...sarvv[ō]nnata-[dha]rma-mahim-ān-a[va]dya-puṇyasy=[ā]bhila-
36 .....rttha[ñ=ch=ēha] bahūni bahu-dēvat-āyatanāni [sthi]rā-
37 [11].....sarvva-parihāra-sahakāraṁ grāmaṁ
38 .....mayaṁ.....[vṛi]shabha-gaṇa-
39 .....sakala-sādhana....ga-śōdha-
40 .....bādhā..saha.....
41 .....Pārvvatī-Para[mē]śvarā.....
42 ..... m=anēka-vichitra.....
43 .....rājita-rājata-[ka]pāla-[pā]li-
44 .....sa-ghaṇṭākaṁ sa-tāla-chchhatra-
45 .....hāra-bhāra...dēv-ōpaka...
46 .....sa-svān=saṁpradāy=ā...abhi-
47 .....bhagavān=Para[mēśvara]s=tu.....
48 .....tayā pratyadhikāram=i-
49 .....prasannas=sēvitō
50-52 totally damaged[12]

Second Face[13]

53-57 totally worn out
58 ...charaṇa-kamala-yugala-vahana-pūta-pati-

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

59 .....ta-sva-maku[ṭaḥ] śikhara-kara-parira-...nadī-Gaṁgā-jala-

60 ....bhāja[naḥ].....lōka-pāla-pālita-...lōka-pāla-pa..

61 ... . A[cha]lēśvara[ḥ][l*] yasya punar=api dvāra...sura-

62 .....parama-jana-prakathita-guṇa-gaṇa.....vāma..kira-

63 ..li-nāga-..pati...jaṭākalāp-āvasakt-āvaśishṭa-Gaṁgā-taraṁga-mā-

64 [l-ā]ndhakārita.....bhakti-vṛittinā yōgābhyāsa-vaśinā Śaśinā

65 .....diś=īdaṁ sthānam=adhivasataḥ Kapōtasya kapōta-vṛittēr=mahā-pra-

66 .....tō=bhihita-nāmadhēyaṁ[11] bhavanaṁ bhuvanatraya-

67 viśrutēr=asya Kapōtēśvara[sya].....ra-karaḥ kāraṇ-āntarair=astamita-

68 .....shita-pāraśabda-mā..

69 .....[15] pāditas=tat-prasāda-pūrvvakaṁ sa..

70 .....[16] pōtēśvarē..... idānīm=ētad=avasthāna-

71 .....kṛit-ābhisandhi-sahāyē s[uja]na...

72 .....ṇi.....piñjarita-charaṇa-nakh-ālaṁkṛi..

73 .....jināṁ[17] Bhāradvāja-sagō[trā]ṇāṁ gō[tra]-parivṛiddhi-vallabhānāṁ

74 .....[18]mala-[vi]lōla-vimala-kira[18a] .....ra...guṇa-gaṇa-

75 .....sva-tējō-vi[śē]sha-vigalita-[19].....

76 .....

77 .....ri-taṭē dēva-....yatām=āryya.....

78 .....tak[ē] nata-Hara-śarīra-prādurbhāvād=u.....

79 .....nadī-nagavad-Avanibhājan[ē*] jaya-sa...

80 .....bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-pād-ānuddhyātē sa...

81 .....[śrī]Mahēndravikrama-mahārāj[ē].....

82 .....prīta-vidagdha-vilāsinī-.....

83 .....Vēgavatī-sanātha[20].....

84 .....guru-paraṁparā.....

85 .....rāja-sūkti-sā.....

86 .....va.....māsa[21].....

87 .....jaraj-jaladhara.....

88-90 completely worn out

91 [22]Śrī-Kapōtēśvar-ādhyaksha-dvâdaśa-dēvakarmmibhyaḥ

92 [mahima]...śrī.....gata-[vaiśya].....

93 .....para-datt[i][23]..idam=āchāryya.....

94 .....ryyasya [24]śāsanaṁ rakshantv=ā-chandra-tārakam [||*]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Above the inscription the expression *Śrī-Piṇḍisvarā*[*ya*] is engraved in bolder and slightly later characters. This corrupt expression may not have formed part of the original record, written in an ornate language. Often the inscriptions of Mahēndravarman I do not commence with the auspicious word like, *siddham* or *svasti*. See e.g., CTP, pp. 47, 63, 66, 76, 79, 86-88, 91 etc. Cf. JAHRS, XI, p. 47.
2. Originally engraved *-sarasyāḥ* seems to have been subsequently corrected into *sarasaḥ* to be in tune with *prathitāt* in line 3.
3. To read here *prathithānpṛithīvi* etc.—a reading not supported by the original—and to correct it into *prathit-Āndhraprithivīyuvarājaḥ* is to ignore the fact that the language of the record is totally free from such errors. See EHAC, p. 188, n. 18, p. 198. The Ablative *prathitāt* indicates that the words *Kōlissarasaḥ* etc. are also of the same case.
4. It is only Nominative Case and not Possessive Case as taken by some (ibid., p. 188 and n. 17). It is to be construed with *sañjātaḥ* (line 12) and not with *Kandararājasya* (line 11) as believed by some writers (CA, p. 203). True, just as *rājan* becomes *rājaḥ* at the end of the compound in the Nominative, so also *rāṭ* becomes *rājaḥ* in the Genitive singular. But such Genitive forms, though employed in verses to meet the exigency of metre, are not generally met with in prose passages, especially in epigraphical literature. For, to avoid confusion the writers would naturally prefer the form °*rājasya*. It may be observed that even the composer of the text of the Chezerla record uses *Kandarājasya* (line 11) in preference to *Kandararājaḥ*, though the latter is also grammatically correct Genitive form.
5. Cf. *mada-vighūrṇita-mānasa-mānini-kucha-mukhōdghāta-kuṁkuma-gandhāyā Vēgavatyāḥ paithḥ* a description of Udayachandra, a feudatory of the Pallava, in the Udayendiram plates of Nandivarman (SII, II, p. 367, text lines 40-42). Cf. also *majjan-Mālava-vilāsinī-kucha-taṭ-āsphālana-jarjarit-ōrmimālayā++Vētravatyā parigatā Vidiśābhidhānā nagarī* and *yauvana-mada-matta-Mālavī-kucha-kalaśa-lulita-salilayā + + + Siprayā parikshiptā+++Ujjayinī nāma nagarī* (*Kāda.* pp. 11, 112-14).

5a. The later Chōḷa queens often bore the names *Ulagamulududaiyāḷ* and *Avanimulududaiyāḷ*, the Tamil renderings of this present name.

6. Note the pleasing *anuprāsas* or alliterations here and in the following lines.
7. Here the context suggests an expression like *a-Kusuma*.
8. *Sima-samaya* 'all the time'.
9. This has been correctly read in SII, VI, No. 594, and in EHAC, p. 188. But the reading *-višāradas* = *Satsabhāmallaḥ* (JAHRS, XI, p. 50), not supported by the original, has led to some misgivings. See Ch. VIII, sect. iii.
10. The reading does not seem to be *Raṇamahāmallaḥ*. Cf. EHAC, p. 188, n. 18 and p. 199.
11. Probably something like *sthirāṇi kṛitvā* might have been the intended expression lost here.
12. Below this, the original most probably contained no writing.
13. In SII, Vol. VI, the following text has been treated as a separate inscription. However, the description of god Śiva with adjectives in Nominative singular with which the first face ends and with which the second face begins indicates beyond reasonable doubt that the text on the second face is in continuation of that of on the first face.

    The palaeography of the inscription on the first face does not differ from that on the second face. To point out a small difference in a *pa* and in a few *ha*'s is to ignore totally the general striking similarity of the palaeography and the language of the text on both the sides (EHAC, p. 186). The only difference is this: While the letters on the first face are engraved in bold characters, those on the second face are written in small characters for want of space.
14. This expression denotes that *Abhihita* was the name of the temple (*bhavana*). Cf. *Mahēndra-Vishṇugṛiha-nāma Murāri-gṛiham* (CTP, p. 66). *Abhihita* is recognised as a name of a chief (see, SED, s.v.). Cf. also

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Abhimukha, a surname of Mahēndravarman I found in his records from different places. See SII, XII, Nos. 8, 13, 14. *Abhihita* may also literally denote what is auspicious or beneficial all around. Cf. *Sarvatōbhadra*. The expression *abhihitanāmadhēyam* may also mean 'having for its name, name of the said person himself (viz., Kapōta)', the *vigraha* being *abhihitasya pūrvābhihitasya nāmadhēyam=ēva nāmadhēyam yasya tat*.

15. Restore something like *pratipāditaḥ*.
16. *Kapōtēśvarē*, an easy restoration, does not suit well with preceding Genitive. If this word is to go with *Mahēndravikramamahārājē* (line 81) one may tentatively restore it is *Mahēndrapōtēśvarē*. See CTP, pp. 63, 173.
17. Possibly a passage like *nata-sakala-sāmanta - makuṭa-maṇi- kiraṇ- āvalī- piñjaritacharaṇa - nakh - ālaṅkṛitānām= Aśvamēdhayāji-nām* is mutilated here.
18. One may expect here *Pallavānāṁ kul-nabhō*. Cf. *Śrīvallabhānāṁ Pallavānām* in IA, V, p. 155 line 16.

18a. Restore *-kiraṇa-sītaraśmau*.

19. Restore something like *śatru-tamō-nikarē*.
20. The mutilated passage here might have been something like *prīta-vidagdha-vilāsinī-kucha-kalaśa- kuṅkuma rañjita-salila-Vēgavatī* etc. Cf. above n. 5. As the Vēgavatī river passes Kāñchīpuram and falls into the Pālāru river near Villivalam, the name *Kāñchī* might have followed the above passage.
21. Evidently here the original had the details of date in *saṁvatsara.*, *māsa* etc., now unfortunately lost. *Jarajjaladhara* 'aged clouds' may denote a month of the *śarad* or autumnal season. For some beautiful description of the season with the aged clouds, see the *Sūktimuktāvalī* of Bhagadatta Jalhaṇa (GOS, 1938, p. 226) and the *Subhāshitaratnakōśa* of Vidyākara (Harvard Ori. Series, 1957, p. 49).
22. These lines, on two sides of *a* big, *Śūla* on the top are now very much damaged and could not be copied properly. For an early inscription engraved on the four faces of a pillar, bearing the figures of a *Śivaliṅga*, a bull and a cow on the fourth face, see EI, XXXVI, pp. 57 ff., p. 67, n.
23. See above Ch. IX, n. 110.
24. Perhaps the original had here the name of the composer of the *praśasti*.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

APPENDIX I

THE ŚRĪPARVATĪYA ANDHRAS

The Purāṇas supply a list of ruling families that arose to power on the decline of the imperial Andhras i.e., the Sātavāhanas.[1] The Puraṇas call these families as those of the servants of the Sātavāhanas. Among them comes first the family of those who are called Śrīparvatīya Andhras. The relevant Purāṇic passage runs as follows :

Andhrāṇāṁ saṁsthitē rājyē tēshāṁ bhṛity-ānvayā nṛipāḥ ।
sapt=aiv=Āndhrā bhavishyanti daś=Ābhīraās=tathā nṛipāḥ ॥

The passage that gives the respective reign periods of those families reads :

Andhrāḥ Śrīparvatīyāś=cha tē dvī-pañchāśataṁ samāḥ ।
sapta-shashṭis=tu varshāṇi daś=Ābhīras=tath=aiva cha ॥

Jas. Burgess held that the above-mentioned Śrīparvatīya Andhras may be a petty dynasty either at the modern Śrīśailam in the Kurnool District, or across the Kṛishṇā at Chandraguptapaṭṇam in the vicinity.[2] Prof. Rapson went a step further and suggested that the above servants of the Andhras were perhaps the Chuṭu Sātakarṇis.[3] This view has been, however, rejected subsequently by scholars like Hirananda Sastri and others[4] on the ground that the Ikshvāku inscriptions associate what is called Śrīparvata with the Ikshvāku capital Vijayapurī in the Nāgārjuna-koṇḍa valley. Following this contention, it is now generally held that the whole of the Nallamalai range was known by the general name Śrīparvata and that it was the Ikshvākus and not the Chuṭus who are referred to in the above passage.[5] It is also stressed that no dynasty other than that of the Ikshvākus could have ruled in the region after the Sātavāhanas and that to this Śrīparvata of the Ikshvākus of the Nāgārjunakoṇḍa valley, the *tāntrika* Nāgārjuna of the seventh century might have retired as stated by the Tibetan writer Tārānātha, and as indicated by the nearby Jaggayyapeta inscription of Chandraprabha, the spiritual grandson of that *tāntrika* teacher.[6] However, it will be seen in the sequel that there are the following reasons amplifying the validity of the above contention of Burgess and Rapson.

(i) The Chuṭu coins from the Anantapur District[7] and from the southern part of the former Hyderabad State[8] indeed go to prove that the Chuṭus held sway in and around the Śrīśailam or the Śrīparvata area and that they could have been rightly referred to as Śrīparvatīyas.

(ii) The present Śrīśailam is famous for its temple of the goddess Bhramarāmbā, who is stated to be one of the 18 *Śaktis*.[9] In the *Lalitōpākhyāna* section of the *Brāhmāṇḍapurāṇa*, the hill is included in the list of 50 *Śrīpīṭhas* of the goddess Lalitā.[10] The *Matsyapurāṇa* describes it as a seat of the mother goddess Mādhavī.[11] The *Agnipurāṇa* goes to say that it is a *siddhikshētra* where gods Śiva and Pārvatī are

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

always present.[12] The *Kathāsaritsāgara* contains a story of a Kāshmirian, performing penance in this place and receiving boons from Śiva.[13] In the romance *Vāsavadattā*, its celebrated author Vasubandhu describes Śrīparvata as an abode of god Mallikārjuna.[14] It is well-known that the presiding deity of the Śriśailam temple is the god Śiva Mallikārjuna. All these tend to prove beyond reasonable doubt that the popular and conventional meaning (*rūḍhyartha*) in which the expression *Śrīparvata* was known to the *Paurāṇikas* and other writers of ancient India was 'the Śriśailam hills' of to day. It is also very likely that it was only to this place, and not to the Śrīparvata of the inscription from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa—which has no such claim to be a centre of the worship of the Mother Goddess—that might have been chosen by the said *tāntrika* teacher Nāgārjuna for his success (*siddhi*) in the worship of the Mother Goddess Tārā.[15] The presence of his grand-disciple's inscription in Jaggayyapēṭa does not go against the above conclusion as both the places are not far removed from one another.

(iii) Among the Nagarjunakonda inscriptions in which one Śrīparvata is known to have been associated with the Ikshvāku capital Vijayapurī, the majority would seem to locate the hill to the east of that city as Prof. Vogel had correctly held.[16] It would, therefore, appear that the term *Śrīparvata* of the said inscriptions is not used in the traditional or conventional sense (*rūḍhyartha*) but only in the etymological sense (*yangikārtha*) 'a sacred *or* holy hill.'[17]

At the same time we may have to take *Śrīparvata* of the Purāṇas in the traditional or conventional sense only *i.e.*, 'the Śrīśailam hills'.[18] For, that expression was known to the *Paurāṇikas* and poets in the conventional sense only as we have seen earlier. Moreover, the word *Śrīparvatiya* of the passage denotes, as we shall see subsequently, a warrior-people and it is well known that in the case of the names of warrior clans or tribes, which also denote their native country, the meaning is generally conventional and not etymological.[19]

(iv) According to the Nagarjunakonda inscription of the Ābhīra Vasushēṇa,[20] a mountain called Seḍagiri is situated in the Nāgārjunakoṇḍa valley. This Seḍagiri must be identical with the Seṭagiri which is included by the Nasik inscription, in the list of territories over which Gautamiputra Śrī-Sātakarṇi claims to have been ruling. The latter is mentioned along with the Sahya, Siriṭana, Malaya, Mahēndra etc. in that record.[21] Therefore this Seḍa (*or* ṭa) giri, like the Sahya etc., must be a range of hills, as has been rightly pointed out by scholars.[22] Now if one assumes that the whole of the Nallamalai range was called Śrīparvata during the period under question, then it would hardly be possible to think of the Seḍagiri range in the area as different from the Śrīparvata (*i.e.*, the Nallamalai range). Therefore it seems that the range of the Nallamalais in the Palnad area in the east was known by the name Seḍa(Seṭa)giri, while the western wing of that range in the Śrīśailam area went by the name Śrīparvata.

The above view seems to receive further support from the above Nasik inscription itself in the following way : In that inscription, the list of Gautamiputra's territories includes, as we have just now seen, both Siriṭana, and Sēṭagiri, thus showing that they were taken to be different from one another. Siriṭana has been identified with the Śrīśailam=Śrīparvata by R.G. Bhandarkar[23] and Bühler.[24] If this is accepted,[25] then it would establish that the Śrīparvata and the Seḍa (*or* ṭa)—

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

giri—the latter in the Nāgārjunakoṇḍa area—were taken to be different, though they respectively represented the western and eastern wings of the Nallamalais. Thus it would appear that the Ikshvākus—if at all they have to be called after the place of their rise—were to be referred to as Seḍagiriyas (Śvētagirīyas) and not Śrīparvatīyas.

(v) The expression *Śrīparvatīya* of the Purāṇic passage under question comprises two parts *viz.*, the base *Śrīparvata* and the *taddhita* suffix *chha*. So far we have seen that the conventional meaning of the first part supports the Śrīparvatīya=Chuṭu identification and militates against the Śrīparvatīya=Ikshvāku identification. It may be seen now that the meaning of the suffix also fits well if the expression *Śrīparvatīya* is taken to mean the Chuṭus rather than the Ikshvākus. In this context it should not be forgotten that the Śrīparvatiya Andhras are described as the *bhṛityas* or servants of the imperial Andhras. This obviously denotes that the Śrīparvatīyas had been most probably serving as military officers under the Sātavāhanas.[26] Now, it may be seen that the suffix *chha* here is under a rule of Pāṇini according to which *Śrīparvatīyāḥ* would mean 'the *āyudhajīvins* (i.e., those who earn their living by war-arms) whose native land was the Śrīparvata.'[27] The Chuṭukula chiefs are known to have enjoyed the army rank of *Mahāsēnāpati* and to be military governors under some rulers,[28] evidently the Sātavāhanas. Therefore they could have been appropriately referred to as *āyudhajīvins*. On the other hand, the Ikshvākus are known to us only as kings and the direct evidence to show them as *āyudhjīvins* is yet to come to light, though one may try to find some indirect and vague evidence to that effect.[29]

(vi) Again the dynastic title *Andhrāḥ* in the passage is more suitable to the Chuṭus than to the Ikshvākus. It is well known that the Sātavāhanas otherwise called *Sātakarṇis* are referred to in the *Bhavishya* section of the Purāṇas as *Andhras*.[30] The Chuṭus are known to have been related to the Sātavāhanas i.e., the Andhras, by blood[31] and to have borne their title Sātakarni. So, they could be rightly referred to as Andhras. The adjective *Srīparvatīya* is added to their name obviously to distinguish them from the Andhra Sātavāhanas. On the other hand, the Ikshvākus of Vijayapura, as their dynastic name indicates, were probably considered to represent a branch of the Ikshvākus of Ayōdhyā[32] and the Bhavishya section of the Purāṇas clearly declares that the Andhras were altogether different from the Ikshvākus.[33] Now, if the Ikshvākus are meant in the list of the successors of the Sātavāhanas under examination then consequently, one may have to expect, instead of *Andhrāḥ Śrīparvatīyāś=cha*, a text something like *Aikshvākavaḥ Parvatīyāḥ* etc. Even if one should take the word *Andhraḥ* in the sense of 'the rulers of the Andhra Country' (for, the Purāṇas do not appear to use the word in that sense), then also one may legitimately expect a text like *Andhrā Aikshvākavas=ch=aiva* etc.[34] At any rate, the *Paurāṇikas* would not all have omitted the dynastic designation *Aikshvākavaḥ*, so familar to them.[35]

(vii) Above all, even the context in which the Śrīparvatīya Andhras are introduced in the Purāṇic passage seems to be better suited to the Chuṭus than to the Ikshvākus. For, here they are stated to have risen to power in a particular period denoted by the passage *Andhrāṇāṁ saṁsthitē rājyē*. This passage is generally rendered as "when the kingdom of the Andhras has come to an end."[36] However,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

the root *sthā* preceeded by *saṁ*, from which *saṁsthita* is derived primarily means 'to stand', 'to stay', 'to remain' etc. Of course the Purāṇas use this root also in the sense of 'to come to an end'. But, the following fact may be borne in mind in the present context. Whenever the Purāṇas make a statement that such and such a family came to an end with such and such a king and pass on to the description of another family in that context they use the root *saṁ+sthā* in the sense of 'to come to an end.'[37] But, in those passages the end of one family is not indicated to be serving as a background of the rise of another family. On the other hand, when one family is stated to have risen to power at the end of another family, the Purāṇas generally use, for the purpose, the word like *atīta*, *utsanna* etc.,[38] rather than the derivatives of *saṁ+sthā*, (and the like) obviously to avoid confusion between the two diametrically opposite meanings of the latter.

Thus the word *saṁsthita* in our passage seems to have been used in the sense of 'remaining'.[39] Accordingly, *Andhrāṇāṁ saṁsthitē rājyē* would convey the meaning 'when the kingdom of the Andhras was (*still*) remaining'. It is now really interesting to note that the Chuṭu coins newly discovered in the Hyderabad area have been assigned by scholars to that period when the Sātavāhana power had not totally disappeared but was fast declining.[40] Perhaps, the Chuṭus started reigning like the Ābhīras (who figure next to them in the above Purāṇic verse) about the end of the second century.[41] On the other hand the Nagarjunakonda inscription of Vijaya Sātakarṇi,[42] perhaps after whom the Ikshvāku capital Vijayapurī was named,[43] and the Kodavali inscription of his successor Chaṇḍasāti,[44] the penultimate Andhra king of the Purāṇic list, show that the Sātavāhanas were holding the area upto their end. So the Ikshvākus could have risen to power after the complete disappearance of the Sātavāhanas.

Thus in view of what we have analysed so far, the Śrīparvatīya Andhras of the Purāṇic passage under question may be identified with the Chuṭus and not with the Ikshvākus.[45]

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. DKA, pp. 45-46.
2. ASSI, p. 7, n.
3. RC, pp. lxix, etc.
4. See e.g., Hirananada Sastri ASI, AR. 1926-27, pp. 185-86; Jayaswal, JBORS, Vol. XIX, p. 171; etc.
5. See e.g. EHAC, p. 396; AIU, p. 224; Com. HI, p. 333.
6. EHAC, p. 126; etc.
7. RC., p. lxxxi.
8. See EI, XXXV, pp. 69 ff; XXXVI, pp. 45 ff. See also above Ch. II, sect. ii.
9. SG, p. 87.
10. Ch. 44, verse 98.
11. Ch. 13, verse 31.
12. Ch. 113, verses 6-7.
13. *Lambaka* 12, *Taraṅga* 6, verse 105.
14. Cf. *Śrīparvata iva sannihita-Mallikārjunaḥ* in the *Vāsava*. p. 100.
15. See also IHQ, VII, p. 639.
16. EI, XX, pp. 9, 23 and 36. These records do not perhaps locate the city on the hill as some would think. (Cf. EI, XXXV, pp. 8 etc.)
17. In a way it can be compared to the term *Tirumalai* (an exact Tamil translation of the Sanskrit *Śrīparvata*)—traditionally meaning 'Tirupati hills', in the Chitoor District—of the Tamil inscriptions of the southern most districts of the Tamil country where it is used only in the etymological sense only i.e., 'a sacred *or* holy hill.' While

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

translating the Ramanathapuram (North Arcot District) inscription, Dr. Hultzsch has correctly rendered *Tirumalai* as 'holy mountain'. See EI Vol. VI, p. 332.

18. Cf. the maxim *Rūḍhir=yōgam=apaharati.* (The *Jaiminīya-Nyāyamālā-vistara* of Sāyaṇa, III, v, 8.
19. SED, s.v. *rūḍha.*
20. EI, XXXIV, p. 203.
21. EI, VIII, pp. 60 ff., text line 3.
22. EI, XXXIV, p. 200. The Seṭagiri remained unidentified for a long time. See RC, p. xxxv. Bühler's identification of it with a Śvētagiri in the Coromandal Coast (ASWI, IV, p. 108, n.) may not hold good now. It is not totally improbable that the name Seḍagiri (Śvētagiri) had some connection with the white stone now known as Palnad marble.
23. *Collected works of R. G. Bhandarkár*, Vol. I, p. 233. The *gō-balīvarda-nyāya*, is not applicable here as we are not sure that *Śrīparvata* or *Siriṭana* includes Seṭagiri too.
24. ASWI, IV, p. 108, n.
25. A few scholars like Rapson (RC, p. xxxv) have entertained some doubts about this identification. But, none has come forward with any better suggestion. Hence writers in general (see e.g., EHD, p. 78)—some half-heartedly of course (see SS, p. 142)—approve of the Siriṭana=Śrīparvata identification.
26. Cf. the cases of the founders of the Śuṅga, Kāṇvāyana and Sātavāhana families, who had been originally military officers and rose to power when their respective overlords *viz.* the Mauryas, Śuṅgas and Kāṇvāyanas became weak.
27. Cf. *Āyudha-jīvibhyaś=chhaḥ parvatē* (PA, IV, iii, 91). Of course, there is another rule *Parvatāch=cha* (ibid. IV, ii, 143) according to which also the suffix *chha* is possible. But, that rule is the *pūrvaśāstra* or a rule earlier than the one *āyudha* etc. in the PA. Again *Parvatāch=cha* is concerned with the word *parvata* alone which is a general name for hills and the suffix of that rule is also in the general sense only (*Śaishikārtha*). So, it is a sort of *sāmānya-śāstra* or general rule. On the other hand the rule *āyudha* etc. is a *paraśāstra* or a later rule and is concerned with the proper names of the hills, like Rōhitagiri etc. and the suffix *chha* of this rule has a special sense *abhijana* or native country, besides the meaning *āyudhajīvin.* Thus, it is an *apavāda* or exceptional rule. Now, it may be pointed out that the word *Śrīparvata* in our Purāṇic passage is a proper name, though its later part happens to be the word *parvata.* Again, it is quite evident that the expression *Śrīparvatīya* is used there to denote the native country of the people under description. So here we have a clear case for the rule *āyudha* etc. which is doubly stronger than the other by the *takra-Kauṇḍinya-nyāya* and by the maxim *Pūrva-para-nity-āntaraṅg-āpavādānām=uttar-ōttaram balīyaḥ* (the *Paribhāshēnduśēkhara*, No. 38).
28. See EI, XXXV, p. 73.
29. EHAC, pp. 130-31.
30. DKA, pp. 38 ff.
31. See AIU, p. 208; Com. HI, p. 325.
32. SS, p. 10.
33. *Ailāṁś=ch=aiva tath=Ēkshvākūn + + + tēbhyō=parē= pi + + + Andhrāḥ Sakāḥ Pulindāś=cha* etc. DKA, p. 2.
34. The adjectives *parvatīyaḥ* and *Andhrāḥ* are each to distinguish the Southern Ikshvākus of Vijayapurī from their northern counterpart.
35. E.g. we have actually the expression *Aikshvākavaś=chaturviṁśat* in the *Bhavishya* section itself. See DKA, p. 23.
36. See ibid., p. 72.
37. See e.g. ibid., pp. 2, 8-9, 12, 14 etc.
38. Cf. e.g. ibid. pp. 18, 48, 50.
39. For the use of the word in this sense cf. *saṁsthitō hy=ambarē vākyaṁ Sugrīvam=idam=abravīt* (*Rāma.*, VI, xx, 14); *buddhi-rūpēṇa saṁsthitā* etc. (*The Durgāsaptaśatī*, Ch. V, verses 14; etc.). See also the *Mudrā=rākshasa*, III, varse 5, where *saṁtishṭhatē* means 'remains or stands well'.
40. EI, Vol. XXXV, p. 73.
41. The Ābhīras who are stated, in the passage, to have succeeded the Sātavāhanas and to have ruled for 67 years must have preceded those who founded the so-called Kalachuri-Chēdi Era of 248-49 A.D., as the latter seem to have ruled for more than 150 years. (See Com. HI, pp. 322-23). But the writers who are inclined to identify the Ābhīras of our passage with the founders of the said Era are compelled to reject the majority of the Purāṇic versions that allot the Ābhīras 67 years of reign in preference to a solitary

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

manuscript of the *Vāyupurāṇa*. Besides, in that manuscript also these writers have to modify the corrupt text in such a way as to get the meaning '167 years'. (CII, Vol. IV, p. xxvi).

42. EI, XXXVI, pp. 273 ff.
43. Ibid., p. 274.
44. EI, XVIII, pp. 316 ff.
45. Recently attempts have been made to amend the Purāṇic passage under study, rather drastically so as to find reference, in the passage, to both the Chuṭus and the Ikshvākus (See *The Bhārata War and Purāṇic Genealogies*—Ed. D.C. Sircar, Calcutta, 1969, p. 120). However, without entering into the question of propriety and feasibility of such a drastic emendation, it may be pointed out here that an interpretation of the emended passage would make the verse in question quite incongruous with what follows. For details see the writer's paper in the *Purāṇa* Vol. XIV, no. 1 (Jan. 1972), pp. 20 ff.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

APPENDIX II

BRAHMA-KSHATRA

In Chapter II, Section iii, we have studied in detail the significance of the expression *Brahma-kshatra* in the light of the Purāṇic literature. In this context the following one more point is worthwhile to bear in mind.

In a copper plate grant of the later Kadamba king Kāmadēva, dated Śaka 1139,[1] the king's minister Māyidēva is described as a member of the family of the Kashmirian kings. There in that charter the said family is also called Nāgavaṁśa and is stated to have originated from the union of a Brāhmaṇa girl (*Brahma-kanyā*) and the Nāgarāja of the lower world. Māyidēva is also described as the very sun in the sky of the Brahmakshatra-vaṁśa.[2] It is likely that the issue of the Brahma-kanyā-Nāgarāja union was believed to have been adopted to the family of the Kashmirian kings, just as the Purāṇic Bharadvāja, the offspring of Mamatā-Bṛihaspati union to the Paurava family.[3]

Some scholars have, however, suggested that the said Nāgavaṁśa was called Brahmakshatra-vaṁśa because the Nāga king who married the Brāhmaṇa girl was a Kshatriya.[4] But it must be remembered that technically speaking the issues of such a union of a Brāhmaṇī and a Kshatriya went by the name Sūta and not Brahma-kshatra.[5] Again, it is extremely doubtful whether in the age under question, a chief, who was bent upon boasting himself as a member of a high and pure family, would have described his line as an outcome of such a *pratilōma* marriage which was not at all favoured by the law of the age.[6] The well-known story of the hero Karṇa of the *Mahābhārata* illustrates how a *Sūtaputra* was looked down by the kings and warriors of ancient India.[7] Moreover, Paraśurāma of the Epics and Purāṇas was known to be a product of an inter-caste marriage of a Brāhmaṇa and a Kshatriyā. He is also described by Kālidāsa as having the qualities of both the castes.[8] Yet he was regarded to be a Brāhmaṇa only.[9] Similarly, the families of the Pratihāra Bāuka and of the Vākāṭaka Harishēṇa's minister Varāhadēva were the outcomes of similar marriages.[10] But they were not known by the name Brahmakshatra-vaṁśa. Likewise the *Mahābhārata* tells us that as a result of the intercourses between the Brāhmaṇas and the Kshatriya women many Kshatriyas only were born.[11]

True, there is the well-known marriage of the Brāhmaṇī Dēvayānī (the daughter of the Brāhmaṇa Śukrāchārya) with the Kshatriya king Yayāti.[12] But that marriage compelled the authors of the Epics and the Paurāṇikas to explain that marriage as an unavoidable result of a curse,[13] and that Śukrāchārya himself had to give a boon to the king to be free from the sins of such a marriage.[14] At the same time it should not also be forgotten that the line of Dēvayāni's son Yadu was not considered to be a Brahmakshatra-vaṁśa. On the other hand the line of Puru, the son of the same

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Yayāti and Śarmishṭhā, the Asura princess (not a Brāhmaṇī) was, as we have already seen, known by that name.[15] All these seem to indicate that the Brāhmaṇa-Kshatriya matrimonial relationship was not enough to produce a Brahmakshatra-vaṁśa. Above all there is no authority that the Nāga prince of the above-mentioned Kadamba epigraph was a Kshatriya. For, we know of a Nāga prince who is stated to be a Brāhmaṇa and whose intercourse with a Brāhmaṇa girl is said to have brought out a family to which the famous Brāhmaṇa author Guṇāḍhya belonged.[16]

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. *Journal of Karnatak University*, III, No. 2 (June, 1959) pp. 41 ff. and plates.
2. Ibid., p. 47, verses 10-13.
3. See above Ch. II, sect. iii.
4. VIJ, I, p. 88.
5. See e.g. *Hari.* Ch. 31, verses 58 and Nīlakaṇṭha's commentary thereunder.
6. MB, *Adi.*, Ch. 76, verses 17 ff.
7. Ibid. Ch. 126-27.
8. See *Raghu.*, XI, verse 64.
9. Ibid., verse 84; *Rāma.*, I, Ch. 76, verse 6; *Bhāga.*, IX, Ch. 15, verse 39.
10. See EI, XVIII, p. 95, verses 6 ff; CII, V, p. 116, verses 6 ff.
11. MB, *Ādi.* Ch. 58, verses 5-8; etc.
12. Ibid, Ch. 76.
13. Ibid,. Ch. 72, verse 19.
14. Ibid., Ch. 76, verses 32 ff.
15. *Bhāga.* IX, Ch. 18—20, 23.
16. *Kathā., Lambaka* I, *Taraṅga* 6, verses 8—20.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

APPENDIX III

SACRIFICES AND TITLES OF MĀDHAVAVARMAN

In Chapter IV we have referred to the sacrifices performed by Mādhavavarman II and the titles assumed by him. Because of the fact that these sacrifices and titles are unique in history, their significance may be studied here briefly.

(i) THE SACRIFICES

The following list of Mādhavavarman's sacrifices may be furnished from the epigraphs of his own as well as of his successors:

1. *Agnishṭōmasahasra* or *Kratusahasra*,
2. *Ēkādaś-Āśvamēdha*,
3. *Sarvamēdha*,
4. *Bahusuvarṇ-aikādaśa*,
5. *Ēkadaśa-Pauṇḍarīka*,
6. *Purushamēdha*,
7. *Vājapēya*,
8. *Ukthya*,
9. *Shōḍaśin*,
10. *Rājasūya-prādhirājya*, and
11. *Prājāpatya*.

Many of these sacrifices are characterised in the *śrauta* literature as *Rājayajñas* or sacrifices of the kings.[1] Of the eleven sacrifices of the above list only the first two are claimed by Mādhavavarman II himself in his own charters. They are stated to have been performed by him in the charters of his grandsons also. But the fourth and the fifth alongwith the second seem to have been attributed to him in the Khanapur plates. However, all the eleven of the list are stated to have been performed by him only in the inscriptions of his great-grandson. This discrepancy naturally raises a doubt whether Mādhavavarman actually performed all these sacrifices or whether many or a few of them are fathered upon him by the later members of his family.[2] However in the context of the Vishṇukuṇḍi history it behoves us to study the significance of these sacrifices. The ritualistic, religious and philosophical aspects of these sacrifices had been well dealt with by scholars like Julius Eggeling,[3] Macdonell,[4] Keith,[5] Kane,[6] etc. Therefore let us confine ourselves only to those aspects of the sacrifices that are quite essential for a proper and clear understanding of the texts of the Vishṇukuṇḍi charters.

Prājāpatya: A writer has proposed to identify[7] this sacrifice with its namesake prescribed by the *Garuḍapurāṇa* as a *prāyaśchitta* or expiatory ceremony for those

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

committing sins like illicit intercourse with other's women (*agamyāgamana*), and drinking wine (*surā-pāna*). But, this Purāṇic *Prājāpatya* hardly fits in the Chikkulla list of the royal *śrauta* sacrifices. Moreover, no king could be expected to boast himself, or his most revered forefather, of the observance of such a penance specially prescribed for the said heinous sins by the *Purāṇas*. Therefore the *Prājāpatya* of Mādhavavarman nothing but the *śrauta* sacrifice of that name which, as the *Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa*[8] and *Āpastamba-śrautasūtra*[9] say, is one of the *saptāha* sacrifices which consists of an *atirātra* (known as *mahāvrata*) and *pṛishṭhya-shaḍahas*.[10]

Agnishṭōmasahasra or *Kratusahasra*: These two expressions had been taken to mean 'thousands of sacrifices' by some scholars[11] and 'one thousand *Agnishṭōmas* or *kratus*'' by others.[12] However, they appear to be used to denote a single sacrifice named *Sahasradakshiṇ-Āgnishṭōma* or *Sahasradakshiṇa-kratu* mentioned in the *Śrautasūtras*.[13] It is a modified form of the *Sōma* sacrifice (*Sōma-vikṛiti*) and is sometimes referred to simply as *Sahasra*.[14] In the *Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa*, an *Agnishṭōma*, i.e., an *ēkāha* of the *Agnishṭōmasaṁstha* with thousand *dakshiṇās* is prescribed for getting the reward of the *Gargatrirātra* (*i.e.* a three-day sacrifice comprising *Agnishṭōma, Ukthya* and *Atirātra)*. Apart from this, three other *ēkāha*-sacrifices, called *Sāhasras*, have *sahasra-dakshiṇās*. They are the *Jyōtir-Agnishṭōma, Sarvajyōtis* and *Viśvajyōtis*.[15] Sāyaṇa too speaks of an *Aptōryāma* sacrifice (*i.e.* the last of the seven *Sōmasaṁsthas*) with *sahasra-dakshiṇā* or thousand fees, the performer of which is called *Sahasrayājin*.[16] It is interesting to note that in the records, Mādhavavarman actually styles himself as *Agnishṭōma* (or *Kratu*)*-sahasrayājin*. Thus the expressions *Agnishṭōma-sahasra* and *Kratu-sahasra* are of a technical import and may mean one and the same.

Purushamēdha: This is a royal sacrifice consisting of forty days out of which twenty-three are *dīkshās* (consecration), twelve *upasads* (*i e.* a form of ceremony) and five *sutyas*.[17] It must be noted that the group of the sacrificial victims in this sacrifice includes also a human being. However, he is not expected to be slaughtered but to be set free after the fire is carried round him (i.e. *paryagṅikaraṇa*). And in his place ghee alone is offered as oblation.[18] Thus, the *Purushamēdha* is merely a symbolic offering of the human being.[19] It must be borne in mind that nowhere in literature the actual slaughter of man in a sacrifice is prescribed and described.[20] On the other hand it is condemned by the authorities like the *Śatapatha*[21] and the *Mahābhārata*.[22] Therefore to condemn Mādhavavarman as an "abominable fanatic"[23] because of his performance of *Purushamēdha*, can hardly be justified.

Sarvamēdha: This is a type of Sōma sacrifice with ten *sutya* days out of which the fifth and the sixth are respectively the *Āśvamēdhika* and *Paurushamēdhika* days. Mādhavavarman's title *Sarvamēdh-āvapta-sarvabhūta-svārājya*[24] meaning 'one who has attained the supremacy of all beings (by performing) *Sarvamēdha*" reminds us of the Vēdic passage *ētad=yajamānaḥ Sarvamēdhē sarvān=mēdhyān=hutvā sarvēshām bhūtānāṁ śraishṭhyaṁ svārājyam=ādhipatyam paryēti*.[25]

Bahusuvarṇaikādaśa: The sacrifice *Bahusuvarṇa* seems to be same as the *Bahuhiraṇya*,[26] an one-day (*ēkāha*) sacrifice of the *Agnishṭōma* type.[27] This sacrifice is praised highly as bringing to its performer the reward of the conquest of the regions

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

of the luminaries (*jyotishmato lokān=jayati*).[28] Hence it is bracketed in the Epics alongwith other important sacrifices like *Agnishṭōma, Aśvamēdha, Rājasūya* etc.[29] Mādhavavarman claims to have performed this sacrifice eleven times. As this sacrifice does not involve as much time and as much difficulty as the *Aśvamēdha* generally does,[30] we may accept this claim of the king at its face value. However, it must be confessed that the significance of the number eleven in this context is too difficult to explain satisfactorily at present and it is also difficult to be sure whether *ēkādaśa* has been simply added here on anology of *Ēkādaś-Āśvamēdha* and *Ēkādaśa-Pauṇḍarīka*.

Ēkādaśa-Pauṇḍarīka: *Pauṇḍarīka* is an *ahīna*-type of sacrifice consisting of eleven *sutya* (*i.e.*, pressing of the Sōma) days,[31] and it has the *Dvādaśāha* sacrifice as its *prakṛiti* or prototype. It is prescribed for the reward of *svārājya* or supremacy. It is enjoined that the *dakshiṇās* or fees for the sacrifice are 10,000 cows and 1,000 horses.[32] According to the *Pūrva-Mīmāṁsāsūtras*, as interpreted by Śabarasvāmin and others the above fees are to be given as a single unit, only once in the rite, *i.e.*, in one of the *sutya* days, or to be divided into equal parts and distributed on each of the eleven *sutya* days.[33] But, the *Satyāshāḍha-śrautasūtra* stipulates that there are altogether eleven fees, of which the first ten, consisting of 10,000 cows each, are to be given on each of the first ten days and the eleventh consisting of 1,000 horses is to be given on the eleventh or the last day.[34] From the above discussion it is clear that the performer of the *Pauṇḍarīka* can have the liberty of choosing either of these said schools. The follower of the second school distributing eleven fees as against the single fee of the former school would naturally believe that more fees beget proportionately more rewards.[35] And he would also claim that his *Pauṇḍarīka* would be equal to eleven *Pauṇḍarīkas* of the other school.

That the performer of an *ahīna*-type of sacrifice does have the choice of multiplying the *dakshiṇā* by the number of the *sutya*-days and that by performing the sacrifice in that manner he could claim to have performed as many such sacrifices, seem to receive support from the *Aśvamēdhaparvan* of the *Mahābhārata*. The *Aśvamēdha* is an *ahīna*-type of sacrifice with three *sutya* days, and therefore like the *Pauṇḍarīka* it is also a *vikṛiti* (*i.e.*, derived form of sacrifice) of the *Dvādaśāha*. The Epic tells us that while Yudhishṭhira was about to start performing the *Aśvamēdha*, the sage Vyāsa advised the king to triple the fees (*i.e.*, to multiply the fees by the number of the *sutya* days) of the sacrifice which has such a choice (*vikalpavān*) so that his *Aśvamēdha* might become triple *Aśvamēdha*.[36]

In the light of the above study we may suggest that Mādhavavarman perhaps performed a single *Pauṇḍarīka* only but distributed eleven-fold *dakshiṇās*. Therefore, his sacrifice may be called technically *Ēkādaśa-Pauṇḍarīka*. Of course, this sacrifice is not as difficult as the *Aśvamēdha* is, and it is therefore not unthinkable that the king could have performed it eleven times as he did in the case of the *Bahusuvarṇā*. But, in this sense the question that would naturally follow will be 'Why did Mādhavavarman claim only eleven *Pauṇḍarīkas*, neither more, nor less?' On the other hand, if the said technical sense is accepted, no such question can arise. For, by repeating the *dakshiṇā* in the sacrifice one can claim eleven *Pauṇḍarīkas* only, neither more, nor less. Again, in some of the records the expression is *Ēkādaśa-Pauṇḍarīka*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

while in some others it is simply *Pauṇḍarīka*. An interpreter of the former expression in the ordinary sense may find it difficult to explain this discrepancy satisfactorily. On the other hand, by following the technical sense, it is possible to explain that all the records refer to one and the same *Pauṇḍarīka*, while some of them add a few details of that sacrifice. Mādhavavarman's title *Ekādaśa-Pauṇḍarīka-prāpta-sarvarddhi* is based on the *Śrauta-sūtra* that runs as *Tēna-*(=*Pauṇḍarīkēna*) *sarvām=ṛiddhim=ṛiddhnōti*.[37]

Ekādaś-Āśvamēdha: Much has been written on Mādhavavarman's claim of performing what is called *Ekādaś-Āśvamēdha* meaning 'eleven *Aśvamēdhas*'. Some of the writers in this context have gone as far as to suggest that even a feudatory king could perform the *Aśvamēdha*.[38] Scholars have already answered those points in detail,[39] and they need not be repeated here. Writers usually hesitate to admit such a high claim of Mādhavavarman.[40] The main difficulty the scholars seem to experience in this connection is this: The performer of the *Aśvamēdha* is expected to protect the sacrificial horse let loose to roam about at its will for a year. From the vast number of chapters of the *Aśvamēdhaparvan*[41] of the *Mahābhārata*, it is clear how difficult the task of protecting the horse would be. Similarly, in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*,[42] Kālidāśa refers to the fight that resulted when Pushyamitra Śuṅga's sacrificial horse was taken away by the Yavanas. Mādhavavarman was not the most powerful monarch of his time as Yudhishṭhira and Arujuna of the Epic and as the said Śuṅga kings of the historical period were. Further, while the great warriors like Pushyamitra, Samudragupta could not perform more than one or two *Aśvamēdhas*, how is it that a much less powerful king like Mādhavavarman could claim the performance of the sacrifice eleven times? Even the Bharaśiva Nāgas claim only ten *Aśvamēdhas* and that too for their family as a whole. No doubt, the Kadamba king Mayūravarman (originally °śarman) is credited with the performance of eighteen horse-sacrifices in an inscription of the time of the later Chālukya king Vikramāditya VI.[43] But the early records of the Kadamba family are completely silent about it. On the other hand, Mādhavavarman himself claims, in his own records eleven horse-sacrifices.

But it must be borne in mind that, as our study of Mādhavavarman's career shows, the king was quite capable of fighting wars successfully and of protecting his sacrificial horse. Secondly, it may also be pointed out that no fight and difficulty in protecting the sacrificial stead are stated to have been experienced by Daśaratha and Rāma when their horse sacrifices are described in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.[44] Again in that Epic, Rāma is stated to have decided to perform the *Aśvamēdha* instead of the *Rājasūya* on the ground that the latter involves fierce fights resulting in the annihilation of many royal families.[45]

No doubt the scriptures stipulate how the sacrificial horse is to be protected and how many warriors are to be employed for this purpose.[46] Similarly in his *Uttararāmacharita*, Bhavabhūti (7th century) defines *Aśvamēdha* as a powerful test of the superiority of the world-conquering Kshatriya, humiliating all the other warriors.[47] However, the *dharma* or the law of ethics of ancient India seems to expect every king of the Bhāratavarsha to see that the sacrifice was conducted in all success. This is clear from Śrī Kṛishṇa's declaration in the *Mahābhārata* while enlisting the grave and hideous crimes committed by Śiśupāla. In his list, the third crime was that the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

arch-villain had formerly managed to steal away a sacrificial horse, let loose to roam about, so that an *Aśvamēdha* might be stopped.[48] That is why only Indra, and no earthly prince, is pictured in the Epics as to have thought it fit to carry away sacrificial horses of Dilīpa,[49] Sagara[50] etc. When the king Janamējaya thought of performing the *Aśvamēdha* the sage Vyāsa is said to have warned the king of the hindrance to his rite from Indra alone.[51] Even in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, only the foreigner Yavana, and not any Indian prince, is characterised as capable of committing the sin of carrying away the sacrificial horse. In this connection one should remember another fact also: While in ancient India there were many kings, both great and small, claiming one or more *Aśvamēdhas*, one is yet to meet a monarch in the history boasting himself as a conqueror of kings in the battles connected with his horse sacrifice. Nor is there an instance of a king of the historical period boasting himself of snatching away the horse of an *Aśvamēdha* of his enemy.

True, the Udayēndiram plates (I) of the Pallava king Nandivarman (8th century) tells us that the king's general Udayachandra vanquished the powerful Nishāda chief Pṛithivīvyāghra, even though the latter was following the *Aśvamēdha*-horse, no doubt to protect it. But, what should not be lost sight of is that the Pallava general is not praised either to have captured the sacrificial stead or to have killed the Nishāda chief. He is stated only to have driven the opponent out of what was known as Vishṇurāja's territory, which he made, consequently subject to the Pallava monarch.[52] On the whole, the inscription indicates that Udayachandra only foiled the Nishāda chief's attempt to grab the above territory, but allowed him to carry on his horse and sacrifice.

Moreover, a study of the concerned portion of the *Brāhmaṇas* on the *Aśvamēdha* and Sāyaṇa's commentary thereunder[53] would make this clear: The horse, though let loose to roam about at its will, is to be brought back to its stable at the *rathakāra's* house every evening. A weak king incapable of protecting the horse from the robbers etc., cannot achieve the reward of the sacrifice. If, in spite of one's best effort, the horse is carried away by some powerful enemies, the sacrifice need not be stopped on that account; a new horse may be brought in as a substitute and the sacrifice can be continued. All these tend to show that the seizure of the horse and the consequent bloody wars recorded in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[54] and the *Mahābhārata* were not the essential features of the sacrifice in practice in the historical period and that any sovereign and fairly powerful monarch of ancient India was allowed to carry on his *Aśvamēdha* to a successful end, the latest example of this being Sawai Jayasiṅgh of Amber (1699-1744).[55]

The real difficulty regarding the eleven Aśvamēdha, therefore, seems to lie only in the long period of time required for it, and not in anything else. According to the *śrauta* writers the time required for a single sacrifice is two or three years.[56] How was it possible for Mādhavavarman to spend thirty-three ($11\times3=33$) years on the *Aśvamēdhas* alone during his reign period of about 40 years? Again where did he find time to perform other sacrifices he claims? The difficulty in explaining his claims assumes a formidable proportion, especially when one remembers that Mādhavavarman's reign was very much crowded with strenuous wars.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

By way of offering a solution, of course, not with reference to the said time factor, it has been suggested by some scholars that the performer of a single *Aśvamēdha* may be looked upon as a performer of three or eleven such sacrifices if he gives three or eleven times the *dakshiṇā* prescribed for the rite. In support of this view our attention has been drawn to the passage in the *Aśvamēdhaparvan* of the *Mahābhārata* where, as we had already occasion to see, the sage Vyāsa advised Yudhishṭhira to triple the *dakshiṇā* of the sacrifice so that the Pāṇḍava might get three *Aśvamēdhas*. Another instance cited in support of this contention is this: In the *Śantiparvan* of the same Epic the emperor Bharata is stated to have performed 1,000 *Aśvamēdhas* and at the same time he is said to have sacrified actually 334 steeds ($334 \times 3 = 1002$). On the basis of these facts it is concluded that Mādhavavarman performed only one *Aśvamēdha* but with eleven-fold *dakshiṇā*.[57]

But, as has already been shown, in a given *ahīna* sacrifice like the *Aśvamēdha*, a *vikṛiti* of the *Dvādaśāha*,[58] the prescribed *dakshiṇā* can be optionally multiplied by the number of the *sutyāhas*, the sacrifice consists. It is well-known that the number of *sutyas* in the *Aśvamēdha* is only three. That seems to be the reason why the sage advised the Pāṇḍava king only to triple the fees and not more, no doubt to fall in line with the *Śrauta* injunctions. The same fact perhaps explains why the ratio of Bharata's *Aśvamēdhas* with the horses he is stated to have actually sacrificed seems to be more or less 3 : 1.[59] Thus, it is extremely unlikely that Mādhavavarman went against the injunctions and gave away eleven-fold *dakshiṇā* in his single *Aśvamēdha*, so that he could claim eleven such sacrifices. Some scholars, in this context, think of some Vēdic *Asvamēdha* supposed to be less pompous than the one mentioned in the Epics.[60] But no writer has so far suggested what that Vēdic form could have been. By way of solving the problem one may consider the following two alternatives, based on the principles of the *Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā* and the *Uttara-Mīmāṁsā* respectively.

(1) While discussing the meaning of the word *saṁvatsara* 'year', the teachers of the *Pūrvamīmāṁsā* conclude[61] that, as the span of man's life is quite brief and uncertain, the above word, in the context of certain sacrifices, may have to be taken in the secondary sense, viz., 'one month' or 'twelve days', as suggested by the *Śruti*[62] itself. Now, one may assume that Mādhavavarman perhaps applied this principle to the *śrauta-sūtras* referred to earlier, and performed eleven real *Aśvamēdha*, each being completed in about three months or thirty-six days ($3 \times 12 = 36$).

(2) The other alternative is this: The king Mādhavavarman might have performed eleven times the sacrifice with certain minimum details only; and the other details, difficult and spread over a long period, he performed according to what the *Bṛihadāraṇyakōpanishad* calls *sampad* or *sampad-upāsana* (i.e. meditating upon those details).[63]

Now arises a question: Why did Mādhavavarman claim to have performed only eleven such sacrifices, neither more nor less? A direct and satisfactory answer to this pertinent question is beyond what one can venture at present with the available material. However, subject to the future researches one may suggest this. In the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the hero Rāma, desirous of performing the *Aśvamēdha*, is depicted as quoting an instance of how an earlier monarch performed that sacrifice to please the

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

god Rudra and how that god gave great boons to that king.[64] It is well-known that the Rudras are eleven in number and that Mādhavavarman was a staunch devotee of Rudra-Śiva in the form of Śrīparvatasvāmin. Therefore, it may be said that the king performed eleven Aśvamēdhas, perhaps, one for each of the eleven Rudras.

Some scholars are inclined to condemn Mādhavavarman as a fanatic on account of his performance of the *Aśvamēdha*. For, they point out "that no one except a fanatic can be expected to perform an *Aśvamēdha* sacrifice and expose his wives to such indecent and obnoxious practices as are necessary in the performance of this sacrifice."[65] But, if one is permitted to pass such a judgement in that light, then one may condemn as fanatics of first order all the great Epic horoes, like Rāma, Yudhishṭhira etc., and all the great kings of the historical period like the Guptās, the Vākāṭakas, the Pallavas etc. who are known to have performed the sacrifice. On the other hand in ancient India, the performers of the *Aśvamēdha* were venerated and the performance of that sacrifice was viewed as a great achievement. Moreover, it is also not clear whether Mādhavavarman's sacrifice actually consisted of those practices or of only a substitute like some *sampad-upāsanā* referred to above.

Rājasūyaprādhirājya: This expression occurs only in the Chikkulla plates and scholars have taken *Prādhirājya* as the name of a separate sacrifice.[66] However, *adhirājya*, evidently same as *prādhirājya*, means 'supermacy' and the Kandulapalem plates tell us that Mādhavavarman demonstrated or proved (*upapādita*) his *adhirājya* by his *Rājasūya* performed according to the Vēdic injunctions. Therefore in the Chikkulla plates also *Rājasūyaprādhirājya* may have to be understood only in the sense of *prādhirājya-Rājasūya*, i.e., 'the *Rājasūya* (that demonstrates) *prādhirājya*.' Regarding the *Rājasūya*, we had already an occasion to see how Rāma, the hero of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, abandoned the idea of performing that great sacrifice on the ground that it results in bloody wars and in the annihilation of many royal families. A considerable portion of the *Sabhāparvan* of the *Mahābhārata*[67] is devoted to record how, in connection with this sacrifice, the Pāṇḍavas had to encounter with many kings and how that rite led to fierce battle in which Śrī Kṛishṇa killed Śiśupāla.

However, there are reasons to believe that at times the princes of ancient India did not choose to fight with the performer of the *Rājasūya*, and that, instead, they supported and encouraged the performer out of their regard and affection to him and out of their respect towards the sacrifice. For, in the *Sabhāparvan* itself Śrī Kṛishṇa is said to have given hints to Yudhishṭhira at the possibility that many powerful monarchs might avoid fighting with the Pāṇḍava out of their respect towards him and to the sacrifice.[68] At the time of Yudhishṭhira's actual performance of the *Rājasūya*, Śiśupāla is depicted to have declared that many kings including himself had paid the Pāṇḍava their *kara* or tribute willingly, and not out of fear or otherwise.[69] Vyāsa further records that at the time of that sacrifice many kings paid huge wealth to Yudhishṭhira simply out of their regard to that great rite.[70] A study of Mādhavavarman's political career reveals that he was successfully maintaining friendly and matrimonial relationship with almost all the important royal families of the Deccan of his time, excepting the Pallavas whom also he had vanquished twice. So, it may not be wrong to suggest that Mādhavavarman might not have struggled very hard for his *Rājasūya* and that his contemporary major powers in the South like the Vākāṭakas,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

the Rāshṭrakūṭas of Mānapura, the Kadambas of Banavāsi, all perhaps encouraged the Vishṇukuṇḍi in his performance of the *Rājasūya*.

The other three sacrifices of the list, viz., the *Ukthya*, *Shōḍaśin* and *Vājapēya* are well known and do not call for any special comment.

Other Pious Activities of Mādhavavarman Apart from the above sacrifices, Mādhavavarman celebrated also the *Hiraṇyagarbha-mahādāna* and the misconception regarding his title *Hiraṇyagarbha-prasūta* has been brought to an end by Dr. Sircar by ably commenting upon it.[71] Mādhavavarman's pious activities appear to have included also taking bath in the holy waters as evidenced by his epithet *snāna-puṇyōdaka-pavitrīkṛita-śiras*, occurring in the Ramathirtham plates. This epithet, together with the fact that the gift village of the Khanapur plates (viz., Rēṭṭūraka) was very near the Kṛishṇā river and it included two centres of holy bath (viz., Tamabtīrtha and Kadambatīrtha) seem to suggest that Mādhavavarman, the ruler of the middle valley and deltaic area of the Kṛishṇā went perhaps on apilgrimage to the upper reaches of the river, as that terrritory was under his ally or relative, i.e., the Rāshṭrakūṭa. It is probable that he took baths in the holy waters in the region and arranged for gifts of lands there.

(ii) THE TITLES OF MĀDHAVAVARMAN

Almost all the titles of Mādhavavarman are based on different sacrifices he performed and therefore are of religious import. Many of these titles and their significance had already been studied in the last section. Among the other titles one praises the monarch to have got what is called *paramēshṭhitva* or *pāramēshṭhya*[72] by performing many sacrifices. Kielhorn took the above word in the sense of "supremacy".[73] Recently some scholars have chosen to interpret the word in the sense of "the status of saintly being", and viewed it as indicative of the beginning of a saga of Mādhavavarman.[74] But the lexicons do not generally recognise *paramēshṭhin* in the sense of "saintly being". Further, as we have seen on many occasions, Mādhavavarman's titles, in connection with his sacrifices are scrupulously based on the *phala-vidhis* or promises of rewards of the respective sacrifices. At the same time, from the *Mahābhārata* we learn that on hearing the extraordinary strength of Jarāsandha, the king Yudhishṭhira was afraid that even if he started performing the *Rājasūya* he might not attain its reward *pāramēshṭhya*.[75] The *Aītarēya Brāhmaṇa* includes *pāramēshṭhya* in the list of rewards of the great anointing ceremony (*mahābhishēka*).[76] As *paramēshṭhin* is primarily a synonym of *prajāpati*, Mitramiśra[77] and Sāyaṇa[78] correctly interpret *pāramēshṭhya* as *prajāṇāti-lōkaprāpti* or attaining the regions of Prajāpati.[79] The *Anuśāśānaparvan* also tells us that the regions of Prajāpati are only for those kings who are anointed (*abhishikta*) after the *Rājasūya* and who have performed the *Aśvamēdha*.[80] Āpastamba includes *paramēshṭhitā* also among the rewards of the performance of the *Pauṇḍarīka*.[81] Thus, the present epithet of Mādhavavarman, just like other epithets of his, show that the authors of the records had a good knowledge of the *śrauta* literature. Therefore it is improbable that they thought of 'saintly being' by *pāramēshṭhya*.

Another title of Mādhavavarman, viz., *dēvātidēva* is found in the Kandulapalem plates.[82] As the lexicons recognise the word *dēva* in the sense of 'king'[83] the above

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

title seems to be more or less a synonym of *rājātirāja* or *rājādhirāja*, the high sounding titles of some of the kings of ancient India. In this connection it may be observed that the poet Bāṇabhaṭṭa, whose date was not far removed from that of the Kandulapalem plates, endows his hero Harsha with the title *dēvadēva*,[84] (a synonym of *dēvātidēva*) which, as Cowel and Thomas have rightly rendered, means only "king of kings".[85] Thus, there is no justification in rendering the title as "supreme god" and in consequently regarding it as a step towards the "development of the Mādhavavarman saga".[86] Even the title *bhagavat* of the Eastern Gaṅga king Anaṅgabhīma III (c. 1211-39 A.D.),[87] that has been quoted[88] as an epigraphical parallel of *dēvātidēva*, is in fact used only figuratively,[89] to mean that the king had the virtues of wisdom, power, strength, dominion, might and glory unalloyed with blemish.[90] The scholars who had already dealt with the meaning of that word at length had also come to more or less the same conclusion.[91] It may also be pointed out that even if the title *dēvātidēva* is taken to be a case of deification there is nothing strange in it. For, in fact Manu praises the king in general as an epitome of all the eight *lōkapālas*.[92] And the writers like Subandhu and Bāṇabhaṭṭa take all the pain to describe how their respective heroes not only resembled, but also in many respects surpassed, the great gods like Indra, Vishṇu, Śiva etc.[93] And the divine nature of kingship is well-known from the famous maxim *n=ā-Vishṇuḥ pṛithivīpatiḥ*.[94]

Mādhavavarman's another title, viz., *susthira-karman*[95] is quite interesting. It is usually rendered as "one whose religious rites are everlasting".[96] But, Kauṭilya seems to describe *sthira-karman* (a necessary qualification of an efficient ruler) as the one who would not stop without completing his work.[97] Kālidāsa also praises the hero Aja as a *sthira-karman* or one who would not abandon his work in the middle without achieving success.[98] Therefore the title may better be understood in the sense of 'a person of great preservance in (*all his*) actions'.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. See e.g. Bo. Ś, XXIV, 11.
2. See EI, XXXVI, pp. 10 ff.
3. Śa. B, Translation, (SBE, Series) Pts. I to V and Introduction.
4. Macdonell and Kieth, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, Vols. I and II.
5. Keith, *The Religion and Philosophy of the Vēdas and Upanishads*, 1st and 2nd halves.
6. KHD, Vol. II.
7. APGAS, No. 8, pp. 37-38.
8. See Ch, XXII, *khaṇḍa* (full) and the commentary thereunder.
9. Āp. Ś, XXII, xxii, *sū.* 10, 15-16.
10. I.e., six *ēkāhas* marked with the *stōtras* known as the *prishṭhyas*.
11. EI, IV, p. 197.
12. EI, XVII, pp. 337, 339; XXII, p. 19; XXXVI, p. 10 ff; SS, pp. 99. ff; CA, pp. 206 ff.
13. Āp. Ś. XXI, xiii, *sū* 5. See also ibid., X, xxvi, 5; XIII, v, 3; xxiii, 14; XIX, xii, 22; xiv, 6,
14. Cf. "*sahasrē, sahasra-dakshiṇā-kratau*", Rudradatta under ibid., X, xxvi, 6.
15. See the Tā. B, XVI, xi; and XX, xiv.
16. See Sāyaṇa's commentary under Tai. B., I, iv, 10.
17. See Śa. B., *Kā.* XIII, *Addh.* vi, *Br.* 1, *khāṇḍa* 1.
18. The Tai. B., (III, iv full) furnishes a big list of the symbolic victims of the *Purushamēdha.*
19. Śa. B., *Kā.* XIII, *Addh.* VI, *Br.* 1, *khaṇḍa* 12; Āp. Ś. XX, xxiv. 11.
20. See Eggeling, op. cit., pt. V, Introd; Keith op. cit., pp. 347-48.
21. See Śa. B, XIII, vi, 2, *khaṇḍa* 13.
22. cf. Śrī Kṛishṇa's words to Jarāsandha *Manushyāṇāṁ samālambhō na cha dṛishṭaḥ kadāchana* etc. (MB, *Sabhā.* Ch. XX, verse 10 ff.).
23. SS, p. 128, n. 1.
24. Nos. VII and VIII.
25. Śa. B., *Kā.* XIII, *Addh.* vii, *Br.* 1, *khaṇḍa* 1.
26. See B.Ch. Chhabra, *Expansion of Indo-Aryan Culture*, p. 108.
27. See Āp. Ś. XX, ix, 19; Āś. Ś, XXII, viii, 28. See also Garbe's Ed. of the Āp. Ś., Index s.v. *Bahuhiraṇya.* A wrong identification of this *ēkāha* with *Ahīna* and a misconception about the latter have led some to dwell at length unnecessarily upon the alleged inconsistancy of the *Śrauta* and *Smṛiti* writers (See EI, XXVII, p. 61). *Ahīna* is a technical term and it means 'a rite with more than one day on which the Sōma is pressed'. See Kēvalānanda Sarasvati, *Mīmāṁsākōśa*, s.v.
28. Āp. Ś., XX, ix, 19.
29. Chhabra, op. cit., p. 108.
30. See below.
31. Cf. *Pauṇḍarīkēṇa ēkādaśarātrēṇa* etc., in the *Śābara-bhāshya* and in Khaṇḍadēva's *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* under the *Pūrvamīmāṁsādarśana*, Ch. X, *pāda* vi, *adhi.* 17-18.
32. See ibid.
33. I.e. according to the *Mānavasūtra*, Āp. Ś. (XXII, xxiv, 9) and Bo. Ś (XVI, xxxii).
34. See XVII, viii, 36.
35. *Dakshiṇā-bhūyastvāt=phala-bhūyastvam.*
36. Cf. *Ahīnō nāma rājēndra kratus=tē=yaṁ vikalpavān* | ++++ *Ēvam=ēva mahārāja dakshiṇāṁ triguṇāṁ kuru* | *tritvaṁ vrajatu tē rājan (yajñaḥ)* ++++ | *Trīn=Aśvamēdhān=atra tvaṁ samprāpya bahudakshiṇān* | Ch. 90, verses 13-15. See below.
37. Āp. Ś., XXII, xxiv, 10. Under this, the commentator Tālavṛintanivāsin writes the form of *saṅkalpa* as *Pauṇḍurīkēṇa yakshyē, sarvām=ṛiddhim=āpnavān=iti.*
38. IC., I, pp. 114 ff., 311 ff; II, pp. 789 ff; III, pp. 547 ff., 759 ff., 763 ff.
39. SS, pp. 343 ff.
40. IC, XV, p. 16; CA, p. 224.
41. Ch. 51 ff.
42. *Aṅka*, V (pp. 104-05).
43. See EC, VII, Sk. 178.
44. *Rāma.* I, cantos 12 ff; VII, cantos 91 ff.
45. Ibid., VII, canto 83.
46. Cf. Tai. B, III, viii, 5.
47. Cf. *Aśvamēdha iti nāma viśva-vijayinām=ūrjasvalaḥ sarva-Kshatriya-paribhāvī mahān=utkarsha-nikashaḥ* | *Uttara.*, IV (p. 105).

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

48. Cf. MB, *Sabhā*. Ch. 42, verse 9 and n. The other crimes in the list those are like the act of setting fire to a city not conquered by war; the imprisonment of persons engaged in sports; the abduction of others' wives and so son.
49. *Raghu.*, III, verses 39 ff.
50. *Rāma.* I, canto 39.
51. SS, pp. 348-49.
52. The intended reading of the faulty passage of the inscription under question is *Pṛithivīvyāghr-ābhidhānaṁ Nishādapatiṁ prabalāyamānam = Aśvamēdha - turaṅgam-ānusāriṇam=api tam=anusṛitya vijitya Vishṇurāja-vishayaṁ Pallava-sātkṛity= ādiśan*-(SII, II, p. 368, lines 56-58). Here we follow the interpretation of the passage by Hultzsch (ibid., pp. 364, 372), the interpretations by others (IA, VIII, p. 278; TPCP, p. 136) being not quite satisfactory.
53. See e.g., Tai. B., III, viii, 9 and Sāyaṇa's commentary thereon.
54. *Kā* XIII *Addh.* vi, *Br.* iv, *khaṇḍas* 19, 21, 22.
55. See SS, pp. 349 ff; IC, III, pp. 376 ff; See SRL, pp. 174 ff., for a detailed discussion on the *Aśvamēdha* of this Rajput king and for a long list of ancient Indian monarchs known to have performed the *Aśvamēdha*,
56. See Sāyaṇa under Tai. B., III, viii, 1. See also Bo. Ś, XV, 38.
57. IC, I, pp. 116-17.
58. See Sāyaṇa under Tai. B., III, viii, 1.
59. Probably we have to assume that Bharata performed 333 *Aśvamēdhas* with three-fold fees and one with single fee [(333×3) + 1=1000]. If so, one may also assume that Mādhavavarman performed 3 Aśvamēdhas with three-fold fees and two with single fee [(3×3)+1+1=11]. However, the subsequent verses in the *Śāntiparvan* itself (XXII, verse 44) and the Śa. B. also (XIII, v, 4, 13) unequivocally declare that Bharata offered actually more than 1000 horses to Indra.
60. Cf. SS, p. 125; EI, XXXVII, p. 128.
61. Ch. VI, *pāda* vii, *adhi.* 12.
62. See Tai. Saṁ., V, vi, 7; Tai. B., I, i, 9.
63. See the *Bṛihadāraṇyakōpanishad*, III, i, 6 and Śrī Śaṅkara's commentary thereunder. Cf. also *Aśvamēdhādīni mahānti karmāṇi kārtsnyēn=ānushṭhātum=aśaktānāṁ saṁbhavad-aṅga-mātra-sāhityēna tāny=anutishṭhatāṁ tad-itar-āṅg-ōpāsanā-viśēshaiḥ tat-phala-saṁpādanaṁ sampat* in the *Kalpa-taru-Parimala* of Appayyadīkshita under tr. S. I, i, 4.
64. Cf. *Rāma.*, VII, canto 90, verses 90 ff; and the *Tilaka* commentary thereunder.
65. SS, p. 127.
66. EI, IV, p. 197; XXXVI, p. 9.
67. Ch. 18-60.
68. MB, *Sabhā.*, Ch. 13, verses 60 and n.
69. Cf. ibid., Ch. 34, verses 12-13.
70. Ibid., Ch. 32, verses 11.
71. SS, pp. 50 ff.
72. Cf. Nos. VII, lines 6-7; VIII, lines 7-8.
73. EI, IV, p. 197.
74. EI, XXXVI, pp. 9, 11.
75. See *Sabhā.*, Ch. 14, verse 5.
76. Ch. XXXVII, *khaṇḍa* 2, *mantra* 3, etc.
77. *Vīra. Rāja.*, p. 93.
78. See the commentary under Ai. B., (Ch. 37, *khaṇḍa*) p. 908.
79. ibid., (Ch. 39, *khaṇḍa* 5) p. 943 and Sāyaṇa's commentary thereunder.
80. MB, *Anuśāsana.*, Ch. 105, verses 40-41.
81. Āp. Ś., XXIII, xxiv, 10.
82. Line 8.
83. Cf. *Rājā bhaṭṭārakō dēvaḥ* (*Nāma.* I, vii, verse 13).
84. Cf. *Harsha., Uchchhvāsa* 3 (p. 138).
85. *Harsha-Charita of Bāṇa*, Trans. p. 75.
86. EI, XXXVI, pp. 9, 11.
87. EI., XXX, p. 19.
88. EI, XXXVI, p. 10.
89. The *Vishṇupurāṇa* that discusses the meaning of *Bhagavat* in detail (*Aṁśaḥ*, VI, Ch. 5, verses 69 ff.) tells us that though the word primarily means 'god' It is often metaphorically (*upachārataḥ*) used to denote other persons also (ibid., verse 77)
90. Cf. ibid., verse 79.
91. See JRAS, 1910, pp. 159 ff., 861 ff., 863 ff; 1911, p. 194.
92. *Manu.*, Ch. 7, verses 4 ff. For a vast number of similar passages see the *Vīra. Rāja.*, p. 15 ff., and the *Kṛitya. Rāja.*, pp. 1 ff.
93. *Vāsava.* pp. 30 ff., 141 ff; *Kāda* p. 9; *Harsha.*, pp. 138-39.
94. See e.g., EI, XXVIII, p. 252, verse 33.
95. No. II, line 7-8.
96. EI, XVII, p. 337.
97. Cf. *Sthirakarmā n=āsamāpya karm=ōparamatē* (*Artha.* p. 287).
98. Cf. *Na navaḥ prabhur=ā phalōdayāt sthira-karmā virarāma karmaṇaḥ* | *Raghu.*, VIII, verse 22.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

APPENDIX IV

TRIVARANAGARA

In the Ipur plates (set I) the king Mādhavavarman is endowed with the title *Trivaranagara-bhavana-gata-yuvati-jana-hṛidaya-nandana*,[1] meaning 'one who has delighted the hearts of the young women in the houses at Trivaranagara'. The king Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru plates (set I) is also found endowed with the same title, but in a slightly modified form in that record of him.[2] Scholars who have dealt with the history of the Vishṇukuṇḍis sharply differ from one another in identifying Trivaranagara and in interpreting the title. The views of the scholars on the subject fall into five distinct schools. They are as follows :

(1) The first school was started by Shri H. Krishna Sastri. Basing on the Vākāṭaka-Vishṇukuṇḍi matrimonial alliance, this scholar, as we saw earlier, believed in the North Indian origin of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. Hence, he identified Trivaranagara with Tripurī (i.e., the modern Tewar) the capital of the Kalachuris, near Jubbalapore.[3]

(2) The second school is of Dr. Hultzsch. He did not subscribe to the above theory of identification of Trivaranagara with the distant Tewar. He believed that the place was a residence of Mādhavavarman. However, he did not attempt to identify this place.[4]

(3) The third school was founded by Shri K.V. Lakshman Rao. On the basis of the epithet under discussion this scholar attributed both the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) plates to one and the same Mādhavavarman, who, in his view, was a grandson of Vikramēndravarman II of the Chikkulla plates. He underlined the Trivaranagara=Tripurī equation of the first school, and took the epithet as indicative of a marriage of the Vishṇukuṇḍi with a princess of Tripurī.[5]

(4) The fourth school has been started by Dr. D.C. Sircar, who on the basis of the common epithets of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and *Agnishṭōma-sahasra* attributed both the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) plates to one and the same Mādhavavarman, the great-grandfather of the said Vikramēndravarman II. He took the expression *Trivaranagara* in the sense of "the city of (the king) Trivara," and identified this Trivara with Tīvara of the Pāṇḍava family (also called Sōmavaṁśa) of South Kōsala. He further looked upon the epithet under question as indicative of the Mādhavavarman's conquest of that city of Tīvara.[6] Coming to the age of the said Tīvara, the scholar agreed with those who assigned the characters of the Pāṇḍava charters to the sixth century and rejected the opinions of Fleet and Kielhorn who had assigned the characters of the said records to the eighth century. Hence, the scholars of this school have also worked out a synchronism of the Visnṇukuṇḍi Mādhavavarman with the Pāṇḍava king Tīvara by assigning the former to 525-68 A.D. and the latter to 530-50 A.D.[7]

(5) The fifth school is of Prof. K.A.N. Sastri. Following the third school he attributed both the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) charters to the later Mādhavavarman,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

but interpreted the expression *Trivaranagara* in the sense of "three good cities", and concluded that the epithet of Mādhavavarman "means no more than that there were three (*tri*) flourishing cities (*vara-nagara*) in the Vishṇukuṇḍi kingdom where the king resided by turn".[8]

Thus, the title proves to be a mysterious and controversial one. It may be noted that the scholars of the second and fifth schools, inspite of their mutual differences, agree to locate what is called Trivaranagara within the Viṣṇukuṇḍi kingdom itself, *i.e.*, the Vēṅgī country. Thus they constitute a single group which may be hereinafter called the First Group. Likewise, the scholars of the first, third and fourth schools notwithstanding their individual disagreements, concur to locate Trivaranagara outside the Vēṅgī country. Hence they make one group which may be referred to hereinafter as the Second Group. The relative popularity of these schools is this : No scholar now takes up the First Group seriously while a good number of writers favour the Second Group. Even there also only a few believe[9] in the Trivaranagara=Tripurī equation of the first and third school. On the contrary, many follow the Trivaranagara=Pāṇḍava-capital equation of the fourth school. Again, a major number of scholars who, following the third and fifth schools, ascribe both the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) plates to the later Mādhavavarman underline this equation.[10] Hence it is incumbent on us to examine the implications of the various theories in the field and to arrive at a plausible solution to this problem. To begin with one may examine the respective theories of the different schools of the popular Second Group.

Regarding the first school, it may be pointed out that, as we have already seen, it is no longer possible to maintain, with reason, the theory of the North Indian origin of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. Coming to the third school, one may naturally ask why Tripurī should be referred to as Trivaranagara at all. For, it was known only by the name Tripurī in literature, epigraphs, coins, etc. of both the earlier and later periods.[11] Again we have already established that the king Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru plates (I) was different from, and much later than his namesake, who was the great-grandfather of Vikramēndravarman of the Chikkulla plates, and to whom the Ipur plates (I) are to be ascribed. Therefore the interpretation of this school would naturally lead one to an unnecessary assumption that both these Mādhavavarmans married the princesses of Tripurī of their respective times.

If on the basis of the epithet both the said records are atributed to the earlier of these two Mādhavavarmans even then it would be inexplicable why that Mādhavavarman should boast himself of his marriage with a Tripurī princess alone. For, though he is known to have married a princess of the Vākāṭaka family, the most supreme power in the Deccan of the period, he did not care even to refer to that marriage in his record. The question of ascribing, in this context, the above two charters to the later Mādhavavarman of the post-Vikramēndravarman period will be taken subsequently.

In order to understand fully the implications of the theory of the most popular fourth school, the following points may be borne in mind : The Kōṇḍēḍḍa[12] and Nivinā[13] grants of the Śailōdbhava king Mānabhīta Dharmarāja credit that monarch with a victory over a Śailōdbhava scion Mādhavavarman alongwith the latter's ally Trīvara in a battle. The said Śailōdbhava charters bear no dates in any era, and

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

APPENDIX IV

TRIVARANAGARA

In the Ipur plates (set I) the king Mādhavavarman is endowed with the title *Trivaranagara-bhavana-gata-yuvati-jana-hṛidaya-nandana*,[1] meaning 'one who has delighted the hearts of the young women in the houses at Trivaranagara'. The king Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru plates (set I) is also found endowed with the same title, but in a slightly modified form in that record of him.[2] Scholars who have dealt with the history of the Vishṇukuṇḍis sharply differ from one another in identifying Trivaranagara and in interpreting the title. The views of the scholars on the subject fall into five distinct schools. They are as follows :

(1) The first school was started by Shri H. Krishna Sastri. Basing on the Vākāṭaka-Vishṇukuṇḍi matrimonial alliance, this scholar, as we saw earlier, believed in the North Indian origin of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. Hence, he identified Trivaranagara with Tripurī (i.e., the modern Tewar) the capital of the Kalachuris, near Jubbalapore.[3]

(2) The second school is of Dr. Hultzsch. He did not subscribe to the above theory of identification of Trivaranagara with the distant Tewar. He believed that the place was a residence of Mādhavavarman. However, he did not attempt to identify this place.[4]

(3) The third school was founded by Shri K.V. Lakshman Rao. On the basis of the epithet under discussion this scholar attributed both the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) plates to one and the same Mādhavavarman, who, in his view, was a grandson of Vikramēndravarman II of the Chikkulla plates. He underlined the Trivaranagara=Tripurī equation of the first school, and took the epithet as indicative of a marriage of the Vishṇukuṇḍi with a princess of Tripurī.[5]

(4) The fourth school has been started by Dr. D.C. Sircar, who on the basis of the common epithets of eleven *Aśvamēdhas* and *Agnishṭōma-sahasra* attributed both the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) plates to one and the same Mādhavavarman, the great-grandfather of the said Vikramēndravarman II. He took the expression *Trivaranagara* in the sense of "the city of (the king) Trivara," and identified this Trivara with Tīvara of the Pāṇḍava family (also called Sōmavaṁśa) of South Kōsala. He further looked upon the epithet under question as indicative of the Mādhavavarman's conquest of that city of Tīvara.[6] Coming to the age of the said Tīvara, the scholar agreed with those who assigned the characters of the Pāṇḍava charters to the sixth century and rejected the opinions of Fleet and Kielhorn who had assigned the characters of the said records to the eighth century. Hence, the scholars of this school have also worked out a synchronism of the Visnṇukuṇḍi Mādhavavarman with the Pāṇḍava king Tīvara by assigning the former to 525-68 A.D. and the latter to 530-50 A.D.[7]

(5) The fifth school is of Prof. K.A.N. Sastri. Following the third school he attributed both the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) charters to the later Mādhavavarman,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

but interpreted the expression *Trivaranagara* in the sense of "three good cities", and concluded that the epithet of Mādhavavarman "means no more than that there were three (*tri*) flourishing cities (*vara-nagara*) in the Vishṇukuṇḍi kingdom where the king resided by turn".[8]

Thus, the title proves to be a mysterious and controversial one. It may be noted that the scholars of the second and fifth schools, inspite of their mutual differences, agree to locate what is called Trivaranagara within the Viṣṇukuṇḍi kingdom itself, *i.e.*, the Vēṅgī country. Thus they constitute a single group which may be hereinafter called the First Group. Likewise, the scholars of the first, third and fourth schools notwithstanding their individual disagreements, concur to locate Trivaranagara outside the Vēṅgī country. Hence they make one group which may be referred to hereinafter as the Second Group. The relative popularity of these schools is this : No scholar now takes up the First Group seriously while a good number of writers favour the Second Group. Even there also only a few believe[9] in the Trivaranagara=Tripurī equation of the first and third school. On the contrary, many follow the Trivaranagara=Pāṇḍava-capital equation of the fourth school. Again, a major number of scholars who, following the third and fifth schools, ascribe both the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) plates to the later Mādhavavarman underline this equation.[10] Hence it is incumbent on us to examine the implications of the various theories in the field and to arrive at a plausible solution to this problem. To begin with one may examine the respective theories of the different schools of the popular Second Group.

Regarding the first school, it may be pointed out that, as we have already seen, it is no longer possible to maintain, with reason, the theory of the North Indian origin of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. Coming to the third school, one may naturally ask why Tripurī should be referred to as Trivaranagara at all. For, it was known only by the name Tripurī in literature, epigraphs, coins, etc. of both the earlier and later periods.[11] Again we have already established that the king Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru plates (I) was different from, and much later than his namesake, who was the great-grandfather of Vikramēndravarman of the Chikkulla plates, and to whom the Ipur plates (I) are to be ascribed. Therefore the interpretation of this school would naturally lead one to an unnecessary assumption that both these Mādhavavarmans married the princesses of Tripurī of their respective times,

If on the basis of the epithet both the said records are atributed to the earlier of these two Mādhavavarmans even then it would be inexplicable why that Mādhavavarman should boast himself of his marriage with a Tripurī princess alone. For, though he is known to have married a princess of the Vākāṭaka family, the most supreme power in the Deccan of the period, he did not care even to refer to that marriage in his record. The question of ascribing, in this context, the above two charters to the later Mādhavavarman of the post-Vikramēndravarman period will be taken subsequently.

In order to understand fully the implications of the theory of the most popular fourth school, the following points may be borne in mind : The Kōṇḍēḍḍa[12] and Nivinā[13] grants of the Śailōdbhava king Mānabhīta Dharmarāja credit that monarch with a victory over a Śailōdbhava scion Mādhavavarman alongwith the latter's ally Trīvara in a battle. The said Śailōdbhava charters bear no dates in any era, and

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

therefore, on palaeographical grounds they are to be assigned to the seventh century A.D.[14] At the same time the above Trīvara of these records is also taken to be a Pāṇḍava ruler of South Kōsala. So, the scholars of this school are compelled to maintain[15] that there had been two Tīvaras in the Pāṇḍava family. They believe that the first Tīvara issued the Rajim,[16] Baloda[17] and Bonda[18] plates and he is to be assigned to the third quarter of the sixth century; and that it was this king who is referred to in the epithet of the Viṣṇukuṇḍi Mādhavavarman, now under discussion. The second Tīvara, unknown otherwise, is believed to be a descendant of the first and to have been defeated along with his protege Mādhavavarman by the Śailōdbhava Dharmarāja. It is now really interesting to note that the same scholars, who are allergic to the very idea of two Vishṇukuṇḍi Mādhavavarmans with eleven *Āśvamēdhas*, thus find themselves in a situation where they can not escape maintaining the existence of two Pāṇḍava Tīvaras both of whom had political contacts, in one way or other, with their respective contemporary two neighbouring kings named Mādhavavarman, and both the contacts being disastrous for both the Pāṇḍava rulers.

Further more, the Tummudagudem plates (II) gives Śaka 488 or 555 A.D. for Vikramēndravarman II. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that his great-grandfather Mādhavavarman lived sometime in the second half of the fifth century. At the same time, even according to the liberal view of the fourth school, the first Tīvara is to be assigned to the second or third quarter of the sixth century.[19] So, this school may have to accept necessarily one more Pāṇḍava Tīvara in the fifth century, simply to be vanquished by his contemporary Vishṇukuṇḍi Mādhavavarman. As we saw earlier, the fourth school includes also those scholars who, on the basis of the title under study ascribe both the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) records to that Mādhavavarman of the post-Vikramēndravaraman period. As this king has been assigned by these scholars to 546—610 A.D.[20] or 556—616 A.D.[21] they may avoid a similar predicament of accepting a Tīvara in the fifth century and may conveniently identify the alleged adversary of the said Mādhavavarman with that Tīvara of the Rajim plates etc. But, as we have seen earlier, there are reasons to believe that the Mādhavavarman of Polamuru set I was quite different from, and much later than, his namesake of the Ipur set I.

Now, it may be seen that even if both the above plates are attributed to the later Mādhavavarman simply on the basis of the epithet *Trivaranagara* etc. alone, ignoring all the other reasons given earlier, it may not be possible to work out a synchronism of that Vishṇukuṇḍi king with the Pāṇḍava Tīvara. Firstly, the palaeography of the Pāṇḍava records would come in the way. For, it has been accepted on all hands that there must have been one Pāṇḍava Tīvara about the last quarter of the seventh century and that it was this king who was defeated by the Śailōdbhava king Dharmarāja. In fact, there appears to be no valid reason why one should not identify that Tīvara himself with the issuer of the Rajim plates etc. Really, there appears to be much truth when Shri A. Ghosh points out [22] that the forms of the letters in the Bhandak inscription of Nanna (or of Bhavadēva Raṇakēsarin)[23] the father of Tīvara are later than those of the Araṅg plates of Bhīmasēna II of the Gupta year 282 (601-602 A.D.)[24] and that the former do not differ much from the characters of the above-mentioned Kōṇḍēḍḍa and Nivinā grants. Therefore Nannā's son Tīvara may have

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

to be placed in the last quarter of the seventh century *i.e.*, nearly half a century after the total disappearance of the Vishṇukuṇḍis.

By way of counteracting the above argument of palaeography, some scholars have proposed to read the date of the said Araṅg plates as 182 (501 A.D.) and not 282 (601 A.D.).[25] But, the untenability of that reading has already been exposed by Dr. Sircar himself,[26] even though that scholar strongly advocates the synchronism of Tīvara and the Vishṇukuṇḍi Mādhavavarman. In this connection, one may also add that the characters of the Araṅg plates bear a good resemblance to that of the Kanas (Puri District) plates of Lōkavigraha dated in Gupta year 280 (600 A.D.).[27] A similarity between the characters of the Bhandak inscription and those of the Bodh-Gaya inscription of Mahānāman of the Gupta year 269 (588-89 A.D.)[28] has been also suggested as an antidote to the above palaeographical difficulty. Consequently it has been concluded that a date about 550 A.D. or the third quarter of the sixth century for Tīvara is not palaeographically impossible.[29] But, it is not clear why, in order to arrive at the approximate date of the characters of the Bhandak (Chanda District, Maharashtra) inscription one should go all the way to the far off Bōdh-Gayā (Gaya District, Bihar) in search of the inscription of Mahānāman, especially when there is a dated inscription of Bhīmasēna II at Āraṅg (Raipur District, M.P.) nearby. In fact, an inscription of the very same Bhavadēva Raṇakēsarin comes from Āraṅg itself.[30] Besides, the above Bhandak inscription itself is believed to have come originally from Āraṅg.[31]

Thus, on the above grounds of palaeography based on the comparative study of the characters of the Bhandak, Araṅg and Kanas inscriptions and of the Śailōdbhava records, the Pāṇḍava Tīvara is to be assigned to a period not earlier than the middle of the seventh century, when the Vishṇukuṇḍis had already disappeared and the Chālukyas were in complete control of the Andhra country.

However, to fix up a date for Tīvara in the sixth century, the above scholars depend not only on palaeography etc., but also on Prof. Raychaudhuri's theory[32] of the supposed synchronism of Tīvara's nephew Harshagupta with the Maukhari Sūrya-varman of the Haraha inscription of V.S. 611 (554-55 A.D.).[33] It is believed that this theory, if accepted, would establish the Tīvara-Mādhavavarman synchronism. But, this view is based on the suggested identification of the said Maukhari with his namesake who figures as the father-in-law of Harshagupta in the latter's son Mahāśiva-gupta Bālārjuna's Sirpur inscription.[34] The relevant passage of that record on which the theory rests runs as follows :

Nishpaṅkē Magadh-ādhipatya-mahatāṁ jātaḥ kulē Varmaṇāṁ
\+ + + + + + |
yām=āsādya sutāṁ Himāchala iva śrī-Sūryavarmā nṛipaḥ
prāpa prāk-Paramēśvara-śvaśuratā-garv-ānikh-arvaṁ padam ||
(verse 16) (Here *yām* stands for Vāsaṭā the queen of Harshagupta)

But, it is to be noted that this verse in no way supports the theory. For, it clearly shows that Harshagupta's father-in-law Sūryavarman belonged to the family of the Varmans. There are scholars who are of the opinion that that family was different from the family of the Maukharis[35] and that the said Sūryavarman flourished in

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

about the eighth century and belonged to a family of the Western Magadha.[36] The relevant arguments of those scholars need not be repeated here. However, it may be added now that the Maukharis never called themselves Varmans, though they had personal names ending in *varman*, just as the names of the kings of many other contemporary dynasties of India. Had the author of the said Sirpur *praśasti* thought of a Maukhari in the context, he would have as well composed something like *utpannō Magadh-ādhipatya-mahatāṁ srī-Maukharīṇāṁ kulē* etc. Again we know that the Maukharis were more powerful and important than the Pāṇḍavas of South Kōsala. But at the same time the verse, quoted above would reverse the case, if we have to follow the identification suggested. Moreover on the basis of the Vishṇukuṇḍi chronology and on the Haraha inscription it has been already concluded[37] that it was Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman (not Mādhavavarman) who was a contemporary of the Maukhari Īśānavarman and his son Sūryavarman of the said Haraha record. So even if the theory of the Harshagupta-Sūryavarman synchronism is proved to be correct, it may not establish a synchronism of Harshagupta's predecessor's predecessor and paternal uncle Tīvara with the successor's successor of Indrabhaṭṭārakavaman, *viz.*, Mādhavavarman IV.

Moreover, any attempt to assign Tīvara to the last quarter or to the middle of the sixth century, so as to make him a contemporary of Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru plates (I) may go counter to certain accepted facts in the history of South Kōsala. For, the very same scholars of the fourth school are inclined to identify[38] the king Śarabha, the founder of the Śarabhapurīya dynasty, with his namesake, the maternal grandfather of Gōparāja, who was a feudatory of the Gupta king Bānugupta and who died a heroic death at Eran in 510 A.D., as stated in the Eran pillar inscription of that king dated in Gupta year 191 (510-11 A.D.).[39] Consequently the chief Śarabha may have to be assigned to the last quarter of the fifth century, i.e., 475-500 A.D. It is known that the said chief was followed on the Śarabhapura throne by: (1) (his son) Narēndra ; (2) (the latter's son) Prasannamātra ; (3) (his son) Jayarāja ; (4) (his brother) Mānamātra Durgarāja ; (5) (his son) Sudēvarāja ; and (6) (his brother) Pravararāja.[40] The last king or one of his immediate successors is believed to have been overthrown by the Pāṇḍuvaṁśi king Nanna or his son Tīvara.[40] To accommodate all these six or more rulers between 500 A.D. and 575 or 600 A D. is hardly possible without some unnecessary assumptions. Further, another scholar of this fourth school who assigns, as we have seen already, Tīvara to 530-50 A.D.,[41] and who prefers to take the date of the Araṅg plates of Bhīmasēna II to be 501-02 A.D., is of the opinion that the last mentioned king, *viz.*, Bhīmasēna II, was overthrown soon after that date by the Śarabhapurīya king Jayarāja.[42] The latter's rule was followed, as we know, by the reigns of the rulers listed above. The difficulty of accommodating all these reigns, between 502 and 550 A.D. is quite obvious.

On the other hand, it is logical to assume that the reigns of those six or seven kings might have comprised normally at least about 125 or 150 years. Therefore, Tīvara may better be assigned to sometime about the middle of the seventh century. This suggestion seems to receive corraboration from the synchronism of that king with the Śailōdbhava Dharmarāja, the grandson of Mādhavarāja II, *i.e.*, Sainyabhīta Mādhavarāja of the Ganjam plates of the time of Śaśāṅka, dated in Gupta year 300 (619-20 A.D.).[43]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Above all even the meaning of the title *Tivaranagara* etc. may not also support the theory of the fourth school. For, as we already saw, the epithet means 'one who has delighted the hearts of the women in the houses at Trivaranagara'. If Mādhavavarman had conquered Tīvara and his city, as believed by these scholars, it would be anamolous on the part of the authors of the text of the Vishṇukuṇḍi inscriptions to describe the hero as a delighter of the hearts of the women of the vanquished city. For, the conqueror must have made them, only to weep. Epigraphs and literary works are abundant with the descriptions of sufferings of the women of the vanquished enemies.[44] Thus in view of the points discussed above, it is to be accepted that the Pāṇḍava Tīvara, might not have been a contemporary of any of the Vishṇukuṇḍi Mādhavavarmans ; and that therefore that king cannot be thought of here while interpreting the title *Trivaranagara* etc.

Coming to the theory of the fifth school, the doubt that arises first is this. If *Trivaranagara* of the title means simply 'three good cities' in the Vishṇukuṇḍi kingdom, how is it that no Vishṇukuṇḍi ruler other than Mādhavavarman of the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) plates (for, according to this school both these charters are of that Mādhavavarman of the post-Vikramēndravarman period) is endowed with such a title ? Moreover a description of the kings and heroes in that fashion is not met with anywhere else.

Thus when the above theories of all these four schools are set aside by the process of elimination the solution seems to lie (*pariśēshāt*) in the third school of Hultzsch who had taken Trivaranagara to be a name of the residence of the king. An interpretation of the epithet bearing on this meaning of *Trivaranagara* may very well be in tune with the Indian poetic tradition of describing the women folks of the capital cities to have felt elated when their beloved kings and princes went around in the streets of the cities, especially after their long absence due to one reason or the other.[45] Therefore it is certain that Trivaranagara was the capital of the Vishṇukuṇḍis. We have also seen earlier how both the Mādhavavarmans of the Ipuru (I) and Polamuru (I) plates brought prosperity to this capital Trivaranagara. We have already identifled this Trivaranagara with the modern Tiruvuru (17° 10′ North and 30° 35′ East) the headquarter of the taluk of that name in the Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Lines 4-5.
2. No. X, lines 8-9.
3. ARE, 1920, p. 99.
4. EI, XVII, p. 335.
5. JDL, XI, p. 39.
6. SS, p. 238; CA, p. 208.
7. See e.g. EI, XXII, p. 21.
8. CA, p. 225.
9. EI, XXV, p. 269.
10. See EI., XXII, pp. 19 ff., p. 91 ; ED, pp, 520 ff.; QJMS, XXX, pp. 63 ff, 314 ff.; APGAS, No. 8, pp. 15-16; etc.
11. See CII, IV, pp. lxx, 207 ; the drama *Viddhasālabhañjikā* IV, verse 18.
12. EI, XIX, pp. 265 ff.
13. EI, XXI, pp. 34 ff.
14. EI, XXXIV, p. 112.
15. EI,XXI, p. 21, n. 5; XXXIV, pp. 112-13.
16. CII, III, pp, 291 ff,
17. EI, VII, pp. 104 ff.
18. EI, XXXIV, pp. 111 ff.
19. Ibid., p. 112 ; XXII, p. 19.
20. JDL, XI, p. 49.
21. HSI, p. 106 ; CA, p. 223.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

22. EI, XXV, pp. 268 ff.
23. Bhandarkar's List, No. 1650 ; JRAS, 1905, pp. 617 ff.
24. EI, IX, pp. 342 ff.
25. EI, XXVI, pp. 227-28.
26. EI, XXXIII, p. 256; CA, p. 218, n.
27. EI, XXVIII, plate facing p. 331.
28. CII, III, pp. 274 ff.
29. EI, XXVI, p. 228 ; XXXIV, p. 112.
30. Hiralal's List (2nd Ed.), p. 110, No. 183.
31. See EI, XXIII, pp. 116 ff; XXXIII, pp. 252 ff.
32. PHAI, (I Ed.) p. 305 ; (IV Ed.) p. 605.
33. EI, XIV, pp. 110 ff.
34. EI, XI, pp. 184 ff.
35. EI, XXV, p. 270.
36. EI, XI, p. 185.
37. Above Ch. V, sect. iii.
38. EI, XXII, p. 17; CA, p. 219.
39. CII, III, pp. 91 ff.
40. CA, pp. 219-20, 727.
41. EI, XXII, p. 21.
42. EI, XXVI, p. 229.
43. EI, VI, pp. 143 ff. See CA, p. 145.
44. By way of suggesting a way-out, two scholars of the fourth school have cited two examples each from literature and epigraphs in support of their contention (SS, p. 401; EI, XXII, p. 20). But those passages, if studied carefully and critically in the context in which they occur, would show that in no way they serve the purpose they are quoted for.
45. See e.g., MB, *Śānti.*, Ch. 39 ; *Kāda.*, p. 185; *Kathā.*, *Lambaka* III, *Taraṅga* VI, verse 223; *Bṛihatkathāmañjarī*, *Lambaka* III, verses 311-14, 414; etc.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

APPENDIX V

TRIKŪṬA-MALAYĀDHIPATI

In the Ipur set II, Mādhavavarman III is endowed with the unique title *Trikūṭa-Malay-ādhipati* meaning 'the lord of the Trikūṭa and the Malaya (mountains)'. Scholars differ from each other in identifying these mountains and in explaining the significance of the title. Regarding this question the following theories are in the field:

(1) The first scholar who first noticed the above record, *i.e.*, Sri H. Krishna Sastri, identified the Trikūṭa with its namesake mentioned in the Vākāṭaka records and on that ground concluded that the Vishṇukuṇḍis must have been distinctly a North Indian family.[1] But we have already seen the untenability of the theory of the North Indian origin of the Vishṇukuṇḍis.

(2) On the other hand, Dr. Hultzsch who edited this record found it difficult to explain the epithet as the Trikūṭa (a mountain on the Bombay side) and the Malaya (the Western Ghats, *i.e.*, their Southern-most part) were at a safe distance from the dominions of Mādhavavarman.[2]

(3) Subsequently scholars like Dr. Sircar viewed the epithet as indicative of Mādhavavarman's hostile relationship with the rulers of the Trikūṭa and the Malaya. Consequently it is believed that Mādhavavarman might have joined the armies of some powerful king who invaded those regions.[3]

(4) Another set of scholars like Prof. V.V. Mirashi, who identified the issuer of the Khanapur plates with Mādhavavarman, the elder of the Ipur plates (II) conjectured that the said ruler must have annexed the Mahārāshṭra region also to his kingdom. In view of these scholars, the epithet of Mādhavavarman, the younger of the said record under question supports the above conjecture. They further suggested that this epithet indicates that on the death of Mādhavavarman, the elder, his extensive empire was divided. The western portion including Mahārāshṭra and Karnāṭaka (*i.e.*, the regions of the Trikūṭa and the Malaya) came to be ruled by his grandson Mādhavavarman, the younger, while the eastern portion comprising Kōsala, Kaliṅga and Andhra went to the former's another grandson Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman.[4] But, it has already been concluded that the Khanapur record was issued not by Mādhavavarman, the Vishṇukuṇḍi, but by some other ruler who was probably a Rāshṭrakūṭa of Mānapura.[5]

(5) A fifth school of scholars, like B.V. Krishna Rao, pointed out that the inscriptions from Kōṭappakoṇḍa (Narasaraopet Taluk, Guntur District) refer to a temple of Śiva there under the name of Trikūṭēśvara or Trikōṭīśvara.[6] And therefore, they identified the Trikūṭa with Kōṭappakoṇḍa itself, situated about eight miles south-west of Narasaraopet. Again, as an Ānanda king also is found bearing the title *Trikūṭaparvatapati* in the Chezerla inscription,[7] they believed that the above

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Trikūṭa or Kōṭappakoṇḍa was originally within the territory of the Ānandas. Consequently they concluded that the title of the Vishṇukuṇḍi Mādhavavarman III, under examination, signifies his conquest of the area from the Ānandas. Coming to the question of identification of the Malaya it is pointed out that many hills in the eastern districts of Andhradēśa (*i.e.*, old Ganjam, Vizagapatnam, Godavari and Guntur Districts) go by the Sanskrit name Malaya though they are known locally by different names.[8] So it is asserted that both the Trikūṭa and the Malaya were within the Vishṇukuṇḍi dominions. This theory has drawn much support of other scholars also in general.[9] However, a group of scholars though underline the above Trikūṭa=Kōṭappakoṇḍa identification, hold that the word *malaya* is the Sanskritized form of the Dravidian *malai* 'hill'. So they conclude that the epithets *Trikūṭa-Malayādhipati* of Mādhavavarman III and *Trikūṭaparavatapati* of the Ānanda king are synonyms.[10] Thus, these scholars do not feel the necessity of searching for the Malaya mountain in explaining the epithet.

But it may be noted that the inscriptions from Kōṭappakoṇḍa referred to above[11] spell the word as *Trikōṭīśvara* only. Moreover, *Trikūṭa* and *Trikūṭēśvara* are not the monopolies of the Kotappakonda inscriptions alone. For, we have got many inscriptions from different parts of Andhra and Karnataka that speak of Trikūṭēśvara. e.g., an inscription from the Trikūṭēśvara shrine at Pushpagiri (Cuddapah Taluk and District);[12] an inscription from Rāvipāḍu (Narasaraopet Taluk, Guntur District);[13] an inscription from Magala (Hadagalli Taluk, Bellary District);[14] about ten inscriptions from the Trikūṭēśvara temple at Gadag (Dharwar District);[15] and many more inscriptions from other places in Karnāṭaka.[16] Therefore, Dr. Fleet seems to be almost right when he affirmed that Trikūṭēśvara, as a name of Śiva can have no allusion to any mountain.[17] Therefore, it is certain that the Kotappakonda inscriptions cannot decide the issue, we are at present concerned with.

True, the Ānanda king Kandara II is also known to bear a title by which he claims to be the lord of the Trikūṭa. But, it must not be forgotten that none of the early rulers of the Ānanda family bore such a title; and that the said Kandara II is to be assigned to the later half of the sixth century, *i.e.*, slightly later than Mādhavavarman III.[18] If so, the latter would be probably the first of the two rulers, to claim the lordship over the Trikūṭa. Therefore it is more probable that the title was originally of Mādhavavarman III and the title of Kandara II may indicate that he defeated the Vishṇukuṇḍi, drove him out of his territory and assumed partly the title of the vanquished. We have already seen how the Vishṇukuṇḍi prince came to claim to be the lord of the Trikūṭa by taking part in one or the other expedition against the Traikūṭakas or the rulers of the Trīkūṭa in the Aparānta region on behalf of, or along with the Vākāṭakas.[19] This suggestion, if accepted, may relieve us of the trouble of searching for a Trikūṭa as different from the famous one of that name.

It may also be noted that the said Kōṭappakoṇḍa hill is stated to consist of three peaks (*kūṭas*) dedicated to the Hindu trinity.[20] If on that account alone that hill could be called Trikūṭa, then we need not go all the way to Aparānta too for the Trikūṭa. Mādhavavarman III, not any other Vishṇukuṇḍi king, conquered that hill and assumed the title. Kandara II was the only Ānanda ruler to assume the title in imitation of Mādhavavarman whom he vanquished. But the difficulty with this

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

identification is that there is no authority to show that the Kōṭappakoṇḍa hill went actually by the name Trikūṭa in early days.[21]

Coming to the question of identification of the Malaya, one important point to be borne in mind is this : Maybe, the Sanskrit *malaya*, in general, is connected with, or has come from the Dravidian *malai*.[22] Even accepting this, it is doubtful whether the word *malaya* in Mādhavavarman's title had anything to do with the Dravidian *malai*. For, it is preceded by the proper noun *Trikūṭa* and one is yet to find an example where a name of a mountain is followed by *malaya* (just as *parvata*, *giri* etc.) and both the words form a *Karmadhāraya* compound (like *Vindhya-parvataḥ* or °*giriḥ*). That is why no scholar has ventured to suggest that *malaya* is the same as the Dravidian *malai* in the compound *Macha-Siritana-Malaya-Mahida* etc. that contains a list of mountains over which Gautamiputra Śrī-Sātakarṇi claims to be the lord.[23] Therefore, *Trikūṭa-Malaya* of Mādhavavarman's title is only a *Dvandva* compound and the word *Malaya* here is a proper noun. On the other hand, in Kandara's title the expression *Trikūṭaparvata* can be a *Karmadhāraya* compound, as the word *parvata* is a common noun. Thus the titles of Mādhavavarman III and of Kandara II may not be completely synonymous. Therefore the Malaya over which Mādhavavarman III could have claimed to be the lord still remains to be located.

Before one enters the question of its identification it is worthwhile to bear in mind that Mādhavavarman III was not the only Andhra king to claim to be the lord of the Malaya. Another Andhra king of much earlier period *viz.*, Gautamiputra Śrī-Sātakarṇi too claims to be the lord of the Malaya besides many other mountains, as we just now saw. As the famous Malaya (*i.e.*, the Travancore hills) was far away from the Andhra empire, one may naturally conclude that the claim of Gautamiputra is a vague one.[24] It is interesting to observe that a question, more or less of the same nature now stares at us while explaining the claim of Mādhavavarman III. Luckily, a solution to this problem seems to come from the well known poet, Rājaśēkhara.

In his *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* Rājaśēkhara speaks of four Malayas. One of them he locates in Laṅkā or Ceylon and the other he describes as the abode of Kumbhasambhava (Agastya) and as the birth-place of the Tāmraparṇī river. No doubt the second Malaya is nothing but the Travancore hills. The other two Malayas the poet neither locates nor describes in clear terms. One of them is described as the place of a certain sage (*gaur=muni-puṅgavasya*) and the other as the birth place of the *chandana*, *kakkōla* and *jāti* trees. Rājaśēkhara concludes that the Southern Wind blows from all the above four Malayas (*pravartatē + + + tēbhyaś=chaturbhyō=pi vasanta-mitram=udaṅ-mukhō dakshiṇa-mātariśvā*).[25] But while giving an illustration for a description of that Southern Wind, the poet quotes a verse that endows it with the following four actions: (1) Shaking the gardens of Laṅkā; (2) causing the curly hairs of the Kēralīs (*i.e.*, women of the Travancore region) to dance; (3) untying the hairlocks of the Andhra ladies; and (4) tossing the piper betels. The verse under question runs:

Dhunvan Laṅkā-van-ālīr=muhur=alaka-latā lāsayan Kēralīnām
Andhrī-dhammilla-bandhān sapadi śithilayan vēllayan nāgavallīḥ |
uddāmaṁ dākshiṇātyaḥ + + + + prāptaḥ + + + + samīraḥ ||[26]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

It is significant that having enumerated and described the four Malayas, and characterised the wind as being born from all the four, the author quotes the above verse that connects it with four places out of which the first two are the two Malayas enumerated previously. Almost a similar verse of the poet Vasuśīla (c. 950 A.D.) describes the Southern Wind as touching the damsels of the Andhra, Draviḍa, Siṁhala and Kērala countries.[27] These seem to suggest strongly that the poetic tradition locates a Malaya in the Andhra region.

In this connection it may be pointed out that there was a family of chiefs who were feudatories of the Eastern Chālukyas and who styled themselves as *Malayādhipatis*. Their inscriptions bear dates starting from the beginning of the 11th century down to the end of the 13th century.[28] Their principality, called as Malayāvani and described as being watered by the Gautamī Gōdāvarī is believed to have comprised the modern Kovur, Niḍadavolu and Ellor Taluks in the West Godavari District.[29] We have already seen how Mādhavavarman III made successful incursion into the Vēṅgī country and occupied some parts of the coastal area.[30] Maybe, his title indicates his success in capturing the territory fully or partly. If this is accepted then it may also explain why his victorious rival Ānanda ruler, Kandara II is found, in the Chezerla inscription of Mahēndravarman Pallava, to have appropriated for himself the title of the vanquished Vishṇukuṇḍi, only partly and not fully. For, we have referred to the friendly tie between the Vishṇukuṇḍis and the Pallavas during the time of Mahēndravarman.[31] Therefore the Pallava vassal's claim of victory over the Malaya territory of Vēṅgī at that time might be tantamount to a claim of his victory over the Vishṇukuṇḍi king himself and might consequently go against the political current of the period.

At any rate, the above suggestion of locating a Malaya in Andhra itself may solve the problem of explaining not only the claim of Mādhavavarman III but also that of Gautamiputra's similar claim of lordship over the Malayas.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. ARE, 1920, p. 99.
2. EI, XVII, p. 338.
3. SS, p. 133.
4. EI, XXVII, pp. 315 ff.
5. Above Ch. IV, sect. i.
6. ED, pp. 339, 427.
7. No. XVIII, line 8.
8. ED, p. 428.
9. SS, p. 40; JAHRS, XI, p. 45; CA, p. 209; etc.
10. JAHRS, XI, p. 45; SG, p. 189.
11. SII, IV, Nos. 915-16, 918-21.
12. ARE, 1905, No. 304.
13. ARE, 1915, No. 333.
14. ARE, 1913, No. 123.
15. IA, II, pp. 296 ff; EI, III, pp. 217 ff; XIX, pp. 217 ff.
16. QJMS, LV, pp. 55 ff.
17. IA, II, p. 299.
18. Above Ch. V, sect. ii; VIII, sect. iii.
19. Above Ch. IV, sect. ii; V, sect. ii.
20. See ED, pp. 430 ff.
21. The birth place of the Narmadā river in the Vindhyas is also called Trikūṭa in the Purāṇas which is otherwise not known by that name. Cf. the *Skāndapurāṇa* (SVP), V, iii, Ch. 6. Cf. also *Vindhyas=trikūṭavān*, MB, *Āśvamēdhika*, Ch. 43, verse 4.
22. See Brown, *Tel. Eng. Dict*; s.v. *malaya*; Brown and Emeneau, *A Dravidian Etymological Dict.*, s.v. *malai*. See also *Malayō=yaṁ girivarō bhayaṁ n=ēh=āsti Vālinaḥ* in the *Rāma.* (NSP, 1911, IV, ii, verse 14). But the commentaries thereunder offer

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

different interpretations: (1) *Malaya* is a general term for the mountains; and (2) *Malaya* is a proper name of a certain part of the Ṛiśyamūka mountain. If the first interpretation and the modern interpretation of *malaya* is accepted then the above passage in the *Rāma* would amount to *giri-=ayaṁ giri-varaḥ* etc.

23. EI, VIII, p. 60, line 2.
24. SS, p. 218; *S. Ins.* p. 203, n.
25. *Kāvya.*, pp. 92-93.
26. Ibid., p. 100.
27. See Vidyākara's *Subhāshitaratnakōśa*, (Harvard, 1957), p. 202, verse 1126.
28. See ARE, 1922, C.P. No. 1; JAHRS, XX, pp. 130 ff.
29. JAHRS, XX, p. 131.
30. Ch. V, sect. ii.
31. Ch. VI, sect. i; Ch. VIII, sect. iii.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

APPENDIX VI

GHAṬIKĀ

The king Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman is endowed with the unique title *yathāvidhi-viniryāpita-ghaṭik-āvāpta-puṇya-sañchaya*.[1] This title has posed some difficulties to the scholars because of the uncertainty of the meaning of the word *ghaṭikā*.

Dr. Kielhorn took the word in the sense of 'a jar'.[2] Consequently he rendered the preceding word *viniryāpita* in the title as "emptying" though he admitted that there is no authority for such a rendering. Hence the scholar translated the epithet quoted above as "one who acquired a store of merit, by emptying water-jars (at donations made) according to precepts."[3] In the Kasakkudi plates of Nandivarman the word is met with twice[4] and the editor of that charter *i.e.*, Dr. Hultzsch also followed Kielhorn in interpreting *ghaṭikā*.[5] Moreover because in one instance the said meaning hardly suits the context in that record Hultzsch suggested a correction of *sva-ghaṭikām* into *sva-vaśagām*.[6]

However, subsequent investigations revealed to Kielhorn[7] that the word *ghaṭikā* denotes a particular establishment of the holy and learned men probably founded by a king, such as *brahmapurī*, often mentioned in the epigraphs. Taking this as an equation of *ghaṭikā* with *brahmapurī* scholars have gone to the extent of correcting *viniryāpita* of the epithet into *viniryātita*, 'donated'.[8]

In this connection one may be permitted to point out the following :

(1) The Kadamba Mayūraśarman is said to have gone to the *ghaṭikā* in the city of the Pallava lords to study the whole of the sacred lore.[9]

(2) The Pallava king Skandaśishya is credited with the seizure of a *ghaṭikā* of the Brāhmaṇas from the king Satyasēna.[10]

(3) Another Pallava monarch Narasiṁhavarman is described to have organised afresh a *ghaṭikā* of the Brāhmaṇas,[11] and to have strengthened, out of his devotion to them, his own *ghaṭikā* so that the four *vēdas* may flourish.[12]

(4) At the instance of one Uttaṅka, somebody is said to have established a *ghaṭikā* for teaching the Sāmavēda.[13]

(5) Amalānanda the author of the *Vēdānta-Kalpataru* and a contemporary of the Yādava kings Kṛishṇa and Mahādēva, speaks of the *ghaṭikā-sthānas* where the Atharvavēda was being recited. His commentators locate them in the Gōdāvarī delta.[13a]

From these one may reasonably conclude that *ghaṭikā* denoted educational institutions where the knowledge of the Vēdas was imparted to the Brāhmaṇas. This is further confirmed by the Nagai inscription of the Chālukya Sōmēśvara I which clearly states that it was an educational institution of the Vēdas and *śāstras* that went by the name *ghaṭikā-sthāna*.[14] Therefore to equate *ghaṭikā* with *brahmapurī* may not be correct.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Another important fact to be noted here is this : The *ghaṭikās* do not seem to have been donated just like the cave (*lena*) was donated (*niyātita*= Skt. *niryātita*) by Ushavadata.[15] Rather, there are in the epigraphs statements like : (1) 'from the king Satyāsēna a *ghaṭikā* was seized by Skandaśishya', (2) 'the king Narasiṁhavarman developed a *ghaṭikā* of his own'.[16] These and similar statements may indicate that the *ghaṭikās*, inspite of their being educational institutions imparting Vēdic knowledge to the Brāhmaṇas, were considered to be personal assets of the respective monarchs at least during the period under question.[17] That was perhaps the reason how Skandaśiṣhya could be praised as a seizor of it. On the other hand, had the *ghaṭikā* been like a *brahmapurī*, no king of ancient India would tolerate to be boasted in such a fashion. So, *viniryāpita* may better be understood in its usual sense, 'supported', or 'maintained'. Or else one may better correct *viniryāpita* into *vinirmāpita*, 'caused to be created'.

It may also be noted that the inscriptions as well as the writers of the medieval period use the expression *ghaiikā-sthāna* to denote both the educational institutions[18] (i.e., *ghaṭikā ch=āsau sthānaṁ cha*) and the villages in which those institutions were located[19] (*ghaṭikāyāḥ sthānam*).

But why an educational institution of the Vēdas should be called after the pot, *ghaṭikā*, does not appear to have been explained anywhere. Fortunately, a help to answer this pertinent question seems to come from an unexpected quarter, *viz.*, the *Vārttika* of Kumārilabhaṭṭa (7th century). That reputed teacher of the *Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā* refers to a type of questions, which were used to be asked in what he calls the *ghaṭikā-mārga* to test the proficiency of the Vēdic students. The concerned passage runs as :

Anuyōgēshu Vēdānāṁ ghaṭikā-mārga-vṛittishu |[20]

The famous commentator Bhaṭṭa Sōmēśvara (c. 1200 A.D.) on the above *Vārttika* elucidates what is meant by 'the questions asked in the *ghaṭikā-mārga*'. He tells us this : Different symbols denoting different portions of the Vēdas were written on bits of palm-leaves or some such things (*lēkhyas*). They were put into a *ghaṭikā* otherwise known as *kumbha* (*i.e.*, pot). When the candidates appeared for examinations in the Vēdas, those *lēkhyas* were taken out by lot and questions were asked accordingly.[21] All these may suggest that just like the unit-time *ghaṭikā* derived its name from the vessel *ghaṭikā* by means of which it was measured,[22] the educational institution *ghaṭikā* also derived its name from the vessel *ghaṭikā* by means of which arrangements were made there to test the proficiency of the successful candidates in the Vēdic examinations.

The above investigation of the meaning of *ghaṭikā* may help us in more than one way : If we remember that the *ghaṭikās* were the Vēdic schools owned by the kings and that there the examinations were conducted in the said fashion obviously under the supervision of the kings' officers, it would be easier to explain why the Kadamba Mayūraśarman, a Brāhmin student in the *ghaṭikā* of Kāñchī came into conflict with a Pallava officer and felt consequently furious that inspite of his thorough and strenuous studies of the Vēdic *śākhās* in the *guru-kula*, his *brahma-siddhi* or the attainment of the proficiency (*certificate*) of the Vēdas still depended on the kings.[23]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Scholars have also taken the word *ghaṭikā* and its Dravidian derivatives like *ghaḷige* etc. of the inscriptions in the sense of a village assembly of the learned men probably with some administrative power.[24] Even in this sense also it is likely that *ghaṭikā* might have derived its name from the *ghaṭikā* 'pot' by means of which learned members of the assembly were elected. Indeed the lot system that went by the name *kuḍavōlai* (the pot-and-palm-leaves) to elect the learned members to the assembly is well-known to the students of Indian history from the Uttaramērūr inscriptions.[25] So it would appear that the said *kuḍavōlai* system was not at all an invention of the Uttaramērūr assembly during the period of Parāntaka Choḷa I. Rather it was an adaptation of the system of examinations by lot followed in the *ghaṭikās* (*i.e.*, educational institutions) in which obviously the learned members of the assembly had been earlier educated.[26]

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Nos. VII, lines 13-14; IX, lines 18-19.
2. EI, IV, p. 198. Kielhorn was perhaps influenced by the *Mahābhāshya* (Kielhorn's Ed. Vol. I, pp. 7, 102) where the word *ghaṭikā* is used in the sense of 'a pot', 'a jar'.
3. EI, IV, 198, n.
4. SII, II. p. 349, verses 23, 25.
5. Ibid., 357, n.
6. Ibid., p. 349, n.
7. EI, VIII, pp, 26, 36.
8. EI, XXXVI, p, 9.
9. EI, VIII, p. 32, verse 10.
10. SII, II, p. 508, verse 7.
11. Ibid., verse 13.
12. Ibid., p. 349, verse 25.
13. EC, V, p. 462, No. 178.

13a See above Ch. X, sect. ii, and n. 44

14. Cf. *ghaṭikā-sthānam=enipa sālege (Hyderabad Arch. Series*, No. 8, pp. 115-16).
15. EI, VIII, p. 82.
16. See above.
17. The *ghaṭikās* of the subsequent ages at times came to be attached to the temples and the kings made donations for their maintenance. See e.g., the *ghaṭigē* (=Skt. *ghaṭikā*) of a temple mentioned in an inscription of 1128 A.D. (SII, XX, No. 99). Still *ghaṭikā* itself does not appear to have been ever donated.
18. See above notes 13 and 14.
19. See SII, XX, No. 154, text line 30; and the *Ābhōga*, op. cit. ibid.
20. See the *Tantravārttika* under the *Pūrvamīmāṁsā-sūtra, Prayōga-Śāstram=iti chēt* (I, iii, 11).
21. The concerned passage runs as : *Vēda-kauśala-jñānārtham tat-tad-vēda-bhāga-chihna-lēkhyāni ghaṭikāyāṁ kumbh-ākhyāyāṁ nikshipya tat-tad-vēda-bhāga-parīkshā-kālē tāny=ākṛishya ākṛishṭa-lēkhya-chihnitaṁ vēdaṁ paṭha ity=adhyētāraḥ anuyujyantē iti ghaṭīka-mārga-vṛittinō=ṇuyōgāḥ ||*
22. See the *Sūryasiddhānta* (Calcutta, 1925), Ch. XIII, verse 23, and the commentary thereunder. See also Rev. E. Burgess' Translation (Calcutta, 1935) of the same.
23. See the Talagunda inscription, EI, VIII, p. 31, verses 9-12. Cf. e.g., ibid., p. 34; SS, p. 184, n. Here the concerned Pallava officer is designated as *Pallav-āś vasaṁstha*. This expression is usually taken to mean "Pallava horseman" (EI, VIII, 340. Cf. CA, p. 271; etc.). *Aśvasaṁstha* (=*aśvānāṁ saṁsthā saṁyag=avasthānam=asy=āst-tī*) may be same as *aśvarakshaka* (keeper of horses) otherwise known in the Pallava records as *vallabha* which also means a 'favourite' (See SS, pp. 190-91; 210). Therefore the officer under question might have been a favourite *aśvādhyaksha* ofthe Pallava monarch and had connection with the *ghaṭikā*, perhaps in his capacity more or less like that of a controller of examinations in the modern universities.
24. See the *Tamil Lexicon*, s.v. *kaḍigai*; EI, III, p. 361; XIII, p. 327; XVI, p. 87; XIX, p. 39; SII, III, pp. 90-91. See also ASI, Mem. No. 63 (1941), pp. 33, 37, 54-55.
25. ASIAR, 1904-05, pp. 131 ff; K.A.N. Sastri, *Studies in Cōla History*, pp. 131 ff; etc.
26. See also the author's paper in JAIH, V, pp. 257 ff., for further discussion on *ghaṭikā*.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

APPENDIX VII

DAŚAŚATA-SAK ALA-DHARAṆĪ-TALA

In the Polamuru plates (set I), the king Mādhavavarman IV is endowed with the unique title *daśaśata-sakala-dharaṇī-tala-narapatiḥ*. It has puzzled the scholars who therefore hold two views on this subject.

Sri K.V. Lakshman Rao, emended the title into *vaṁśa-gata-sakala-dharaṇī-tala-narapatiḥ* and understood it in the sense "(one) who has subdued all the rulers on the surface of the earth."[1] Another scholar approved the above emendation but rendered it as "the lord of the entire vast kingdom of the earth that had descended to him from his ancestors".[2]

On the other hand, proposing no emendation, M.S. Sarma interpreted the title as "the lord of all one thousand country". He identified this "one thousand country" with the Vēṅgī-1000 country.[3] To support this interpretation our attention to the title *Vēṅgī-sahasra-kshm-ādhīśa* of Ayyapa, a petty chief of the he drew Vēṅgī area found in his inscription of Śaka 1159,[4] and to the expression *Vēṅgī-sahasra-rāshṭrakūṭa-pramukhān* met with in an inscription of the Eastern Chālukya Amma II.[5] And this interpretation of Sri Sarma has got the approval of other scholars also, like Dr. Sircar etc.[6]

But it is evident that the first theory suffers too much from the assumption that the title, as found in the record, is erraneous and requires emendation. For, the introductory and the formal portions of the record are free from such serious errors. Similarly if one follows the second interpretation, then it will be difficult to explain why the Vēṅgī-1000 country should be referred to as *daśaśata-sakala-dharaṇī-tala* or 'ten-hundred all the earth' and not something like *sahasra-dharaṇī-tala*, as we find in other records mentioned above. For, unless there is some valid reason, no Sanskrit writer would substitute *daśa-śata* for *sahasra*, especially in prose. Again it is also extremely doubtful whether there could have existed any such division of Vēṅgī before the advent of the Eastern Chālukyas.[7] Moreover just like Mādhavavarman IV, every other member of the Vishṇukuṇḍi family was the master of the entire Vēṅgī country. Therefore, it would be inexplicable why Mādhavavarman IV alone, and not any one else, should be endowed with such title. So, the explanation of the title must be altogether different.

Luckily, the clue to the interpretation of this title seems to have been supplied by the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya and by the *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* of Rājaśēkhara. In the first chapter of the nineth *adhikaraṇa* of the *Arthaśāstra*, Kauṭilya tells us that the *chakravarttikshētra*, that lies between the Himālayas in the north and the ocean in the south (*i.e.*, the Indian Ocean) measures 1000 *yōjanas*. The passage in question runs :

Dēśaḥ pṛithivī tasyāṁ Himavt-samudr-āntaram=udīchīnaṁ yōjana-sahasra-parimāṇam atiryak chakravarttikshētram |[8]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Similarly in the 17th chapter entitled *Dēśavibhāga* or 'Division of the Earth', in his *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*, the poet Rājaśēkhara tells us that in the *chakravarttikshētra*, stretching from Kumārīpura (*i.e.*, Cape Comorin) to the Bindu-saras (in the Himālayas) the water and landed territories constitute 500 *yōjanas* each, and the *chakravarttikshētra* thus comprises ten hundred *yōjanas* altogether. The relevant passage goes as follows:

Pañcha śatāni jalaṁ, pañcha sthalam=iti vibhāgēna + + + + Kumārīpurāt= prabhṛiti Bindusarō=vadhi yōjanānāṁ daśa-śatī chakravarttikshētram l
tāṁ vijayamānaḥ chakravarttī bhavati. l[9]

The similarity that the expression *daśa-śatī chakravartṭikshētram* of the above passage bears with the title, we are here concerned with, is too striking to be missed. Now the expression *daśa-śata* in the place of *sahasra* has also a good purpose to serve.

Again the expression *sarvā pṛithivī* in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[10] and *savapuṭhạvi* (Skt. *sarvā pṛithivī*) in the fifth Rock Edict of Aśōka at Dhauli[11] though mean literally 'all the earth' are known to have been used to denote the *chakravarttikshētra*.[12] Therefore their synonym *sakala-dharaṇītala* in the title of Mādhavavarman must denote the *chakravarttikshētra*. So, it is hardly needed to say that the above title of Mādhavavarman IV is based on the literary convention of ancient India and therefore it is to be rendered as 'the king of all the earth (i.e. *chakravarttikshētra*) (*measuring*) ten hundred (*yōjanas*)'.

Incidentally it may be pointed out that even as late as 566 A.D., *i.e.*, the date of the Tummalagudem set II, the greatest of the Vishṇukuṇḍi kings, *viz.*, Mādhavavarman II had been described only as the lord of the land encircled by the waters of the Rēvā on the north and the seas on the east, south and west.[13] This land is nothing but the whole of the *Dakshiṇāpatha* or the Deccan, that constitutes the southern *chakravarttikshētra* of the ancient Indian tradition.[14] Now in the Polamuru set I, for the first time in the history of the Vishṇukuṇḍis as well as in the history of South India, we find a description of a king as the lord of the whole of India. *i.e.*, from the Kumārīpura to the Himālayas. This exaggerated claim of Mādhavavarman IV does distinguish him from Mādhavavarman II whose claims are comparatively moderate.

The above title of Mādhavavarman IV thus interpreted would remind us of a benedictory verse found in the Vayalur inscription of the Pallava king Rājasiṁha II, which prays that the monarch may rule what is called *dvīpa-laksha*. And the passage in question reads as:

vahatu Raṇajayaḥ Śrīnidhir=dvīpa-laksham l[15]

Here too the expression *dvīpa-laksha* has puzzled the scholars, who therefore doubtfully rendered it as "thousand islands" etc., and took it to stand for the Lakshadvīpa or the Laccadive Islands and so on.[16] But why should a king of Kāñchī long for the rulership of the Laccadive Islands, excluding the main land of India ? Therefore it appears that just as in Mādhavavarman's title the expression *daśa-śata* stands for ten hundred *yōjanas* of the *chakravarttikshētra*, so also in the above verse of the Vayalur inscription, the word *laksha* stands for one lakh of *yōjanas* of the *dvīpa*, *i.e.*,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

the Jambūdvīpa. This is quite in tune with the tradition of the Purāṇic literature according to which the area of the Jambūdvīpa, or the continent in which we live, is one lakh of *yōjanas*.[17]

Now, the above passage of the Vayalur inscription may also stand in a good comparison to Bāṇa's description of Harshavardhana as a ruler of all the *dvīpa*, i.e., Jambūdvīpa (*sarva-dvīpa-bhuk*).[18] It may also be remembered that in his Minor Rock Edict I Aśōka refers to his empire as Jambūdvīpa,[19] and that in the Buddhist literature that Mauryan emperor is called as *dīpa-chakkavatti* (Skt. *dvīpachakra-varttin*) as superior to *pādesa-rājas* (Skt. *pradēśa-rājas*).[20]

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. JDL, XI, p. 61.
2. ED, p. 546.
3. JOR, XI, pp. 221 ff.
4. SII, VI, No. 96.
5. EI, IX, p. 131 ff.
6. SS, pp. 126, 400.
7. The earliest known reference to the Vēṅgī-sahasra-grāmas may be perhaps in an inscription of Guṇaga Vijayāditya (848-91 A.D.). See the *Bhārati* XXII, (1946), pp. 370 ff.
8. *Artha*. p. 340.
9. *Kāvya*., p. 92.
10. *Kāṇḍa* XIII, *Addhyāya* 5, *Brā*. 4, *khaṇḍa* 13.
11. CII, I, p. 87, line 7.
12. See also SG, pp. 2-3.
13. No. VIII, lines 8-9.
14. See SG, pp. 13 ff.
15. EI, XVIII, p. 151, verse 2.
16. Ibid., p. 152 and n.; KESIH, p. 116.
17. See e.g., *Vishṇupurāṇa, Aṁśa*, II, Ch. 3, verse 27; *Vāmana*., Ch. 11, verse 33; *Matsya*., Ch. 113, verses 7-8; etc.
18. *Harsha*., *Uchchhvāsa* III (p. 138).
19. CII, I, p. 175, line 3; etc.
20. See Malalasekhara, *Dict. of Pali Proper Names*, s.v. *Asōka*; SG; p. 3.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

attached to the pleasures of this and the other world.'[14] The above description of Mādhavavarman IV, as interpreted now, reminds us of a similar description of the aged Raghu by Kālidāsa. The verse under question goes :

Vishayēshu vināśa-dharmasu tridivasthēshv=api niḥspṛihō=bhavat.[15]

By his 48th regnal year, Mādhavavarman IV might have passed at least 68, and the composer of the Polamuru text perhaps thought it appropriate to picture his aged hero in the way Kālidāsa had characterised his aged hero Raghu in the above verse.

Before concluding it may be pointed out that indulging himself in the *ślēsha* or pun, the author of the Polamuru text perhaps intended to convey all the above and other possible ideas—not one or two alone—by the epithet (or epithets) under examination, viz., *avasita-vividha-divya-strī (or °s=Trī)vara-nagara-bhavana-gata-parama-yuvati-jana-viharaṇa-ratiḥ.*

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. See JAHRS, VI, pp. 17 ff; SS, pp. 127 ff., 334 ff.
2. SS, p. 127.
3. Ibid., pp. 127-28; ED, pp. 540 ff; etc.
4. See also JDL, VI, pp. 54 ff; EI, XXIII, p. 90.
5. Cf. *agni-tulā-suddhiḥ suvarṇānām* in the *Vāsava.* p. 28.
6. Cf. *Śaśinaḥ kanyā-tulā-rōhaṇam,* ibid , p. 145.
7. See SS, pp. 368-69.
8. Cf. *vanakariṇāṁ vāri-pravēśaḥ, vratinām= agni-dhāraṇam, grahāṇāṁ tulā-rōhaṇam, Agasty-ōdayē visha-śuddhiḥ* in the *Kāda.* p. 126.
9. See No. X, lines 14 ff., and notes thereunder.
10. See *Vīra. Vyavahāra.*, p. 169, for quotations from different *smṛitis* on this point.
11. See Tawney's *The Ocean of Story*, Ed. N.M. Penzer, Vol. V, p. 175.
12. *Kāvya.* p. 92.
13. SII, I, p. 54, lines 23-26. See also SG, pp. 34 ff.
14. SII, XII, Nos. 8, 13.
15. *Raghu.* VIII, verse 10.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. ORIGINAL SOURCES

(i) Epigraphical

The primary epigraphical sources of our study are the eighteen inscriptions given in Part Two. Besides, the following inscriptions also have bearing on the subject.

Achyutapuram Plates of the Gaṅga Indravarman II, Rajasiṁha, Year 87, EI, III, pp. 128ff.

Aihole Praśasti of the Chālukya Pulakēśi II, Śaka 556, EI, VI, 1ff.

Ajanta Cave (XVI) Inscription of Varāhadēva, CII, V, pp. 103ff.

Badami Inscription of the Chālukya Vallabhēśvara (Pulakēśi I), Śaka 465, EI, XXVII, pp. 4ff.

Balaghat Plates of the Vākāṭaka Pṛithivīshēṇa II, CII, V, pp. 79ff.

Banaras Plates of Harirāja, *Ancient India*, No. 5, plates XXI and XXII.

Goa plates of Satyāśraya Dhruvarāja Indravarman, Śaka Year 532, JBBRAS, X, pp. 365ff.

Gokak Plates of the Rāshṭrakūṭa Dējja Mahārāja, Āguptāyika Year 845, EI, XXI, pp. 289ff.

Halsi Plates of the Kadamba Ravivarman, IA, VI, pp. 25ff.

Haraha Inscription of the time of Maukharī Iśānavarman, V.S. 661, EI, XIV, pp. 110ff.

Hisse-Borala Inscription of the Vākāṭaka Dēvasēna, Śaka 380, EI, XXXVII, pp. 1ff.

Hyderabad Plates of Pulakēśi II, IA, VI, pp. 71ff.

Jaunpur Fragmentary Inscription of the Maukhari Dynasty, CII, III, pp. 228ff.

Junagadh Inscription of Kshatrapa Rudradāman I, Year 72, EI, VIII, pp. 36ff.

Kasakkuḍi Plates of Nandivarman Pallavamalla, Year 22, SII, II, pp. 342ff.

Kondamudi Plates of the Bṛihatphalāyana Jayavarman, Year 10, EI, VI pp. 315ff.

Kopparam Plates of the Chālukya Pulakēśi II, Year 21, EI, XVIII, pp. 257ff.

Kuram Plates of the Pallava Paramēśvaravarman I, SII, I, pp. 144ff; EI, XVII, pp. 340ff.

Mahākūṭa (Badami) Pillar Inscription of the Chālukya Maṅgalēśa, Year 5, IA, XIX, pp. 7ff.

Mallam Inscription of the Pallava Nandipōtaraśar (Nandivarman Pallavamalla) Year 15, A. Soc. SI. Trans. 1959-60, pp. 17ff.

Mangaluru Grant of the Pallava Siṁhavarman, Year 8, IA, V, pp. 154ff

Nagai Inscription of Somēśvara I, Śaka 980, *Hyd. Arch. Series*, No. 8.

Nagarjunakonda Inscriptions, EI, XX, pp. 1ff; XXI 61ff; XXXV, pp. 1ff.

Nagarjunakonda Inscription of the Ābhīra Vasushēṇa, Year 10, EI, XXXIV, pp. 197ff.

Narasingapalli Plates of the Gaṅga Hastivarman, Year 79, EI, XXIII, pp. 62ff.

Nasik Inscription of Vāsishṭhiputra Puḷumāvi, Year 19, EI, VIII, pp. 60ff.

Nerur Plates of the Chālukya Maṅgalēśa, IA, VII, pp. 161ff.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Vaiśēshikadarśana of Kaṇāda, with comm., Benares, 1923.

Vāmanapurāṇa, Jagaddhitēchchhu Press, Śaka 1808.

Vāsavadattā of Subandhu, with comm., Śrirangam, 1906.

Vāyupurāṇa, ASS, 1905.

Viddhasālabañjikā of Rājaśēkhara, edited by B.R. Arte, Poona, 1886.

Vīramitrōdaya, Rājanītiprakāsa and *Vyamahāraprakāśa* of Mitramiśra, Benares.

Vishṇupurāṇa with comm., SVP, Śaka 1832.

Vishṇudharmōttarapurāṇa, SVP, Śaka 1834.

Yājñavalkyasmṛiti with Vijñānēśvara's comm., NSP, 1936, with Aparāska's Comm., ASS, 1902.

(iii) *Lexicons*

Apte's Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Vol. I-III, Poona, 1957-59.

Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary by Franklin Edgerten, Yale University, 1953.

The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval India, by Nundolol Dey, 1927.

Indian Epigraphical Glossary, by D.C. Sircar, 1966.

Nāmaliṅgāmuśāsana of Amarasiṁha with Bhānuji Dīkshita's comm., NSP, 1915.

Pali-English Dictionary, PTS, 1925.

A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, by Sir Monier Monier-Williams, Oxford, 1899.

Vaijayantī of Yādavaprakāśa, edited by G. Oppert, Madras, 1895.

(iv) *Atlas*

The Imperial Gazetter of India, Vol. XXVI, *Atlas*, Oxford, 1931.

Madras Presidency District Atlas, Madras, 1932.

II. MODERN WORKS AND ARTICLES

Altekar, A.S. *The Rāshṭrakūṭas and Their Times*, Poona, 1934.

Aiyar, Subrahmanya, K.V. *Historical Sketches of Ancient Dekhan*, Vol. II, Coimbatore, 1967.

Three Lectures, Dharwar, 1941.

Aravamuthan, T. G. *The Early Pallavas of Kāñchī*, A. Soc. S.I. (1962), pp. 51-84.

The Kāverī. The Maukharis and The Saṅgam Age, Madras, 1925.

Benerji, R.D. *History of Orissa*, Vols. I, II, Calcutta, 1930.

Benjamin Rowland *The Art And Architecture of India* (Penguin Books) 1953.

Bhandarkar, D.R. *Aśvamēdha by Samudragupta*, IC, I, pp. 115ff.

Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population, IA, XL, pp. 7ff.

Lectures on the Ancient History of India (The Carmichael Lectures), Calcutta, 1912.

Guhilots, JPASB (NS) V, pp. 167ff.

Bhandarkar, R.G. *Early History of the Dakkan*, BG, (1895), pp. 133-275.

Brown, C.J. *The Coins of India*, Calcutta, 1922.

Buhler, G. *Indian Palaeographical Tables.*

Chhabra, B. Ch. *Expansion of Indo-Āryan Culture*, Delhi, 1965.

Coomaraswamy Ananda K. *History of Indian And Indonesian Art*, London, 1927.

Cousen, H. *The Chālukyan Architecture of the Kanarese Districts*, 1926.

Desai, P.B. *Choudadanpur Copper Plates of Kadamba Kāmadēva, Śaka 1139*, Journal of the Karnatak University, III, No. 2 (June, 1959) pp. 41ff.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Jainism in South India and Some Jaina Epigraphs, Sholapur, 1957.

Elliot, W. *Coins of Southern India*, 1886.

Fleet, J.F. Ed. *CII*, III.

Calculation of Hindu Dates, No. 5, IA, XVI, pp. 109ff. No. 8, IA, XVII, pp. 141ff.

The Chronology of the Eastern Chālukya Kings, IA, XX, pp. 1ff.

The Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts of the Bombay Presidency, BG. I, pt. ii pp. 276-584.

Godāvari plates of Pṛithivīmūla, JBBRAS, XVI, pp. 114ff.

Notes on Inscriptions At Gaddak etc., IA, II, pp. 296ff.

Ghosal, R.K. *Jirjingi Plates of Gaṅga Indravarman*, EI, XXV, pp. 281ff.

Ghosh, A. *Date of Pāṇḍava Kings of Southern, Kosala*, EI, XXV, pp. 266-70.

A Not on Aśvamēdha, IC, III, p. 759f.

Ghosh Bhramar (Miss) *The Caste of the Sātavahana Rulers of the Deccan*, IC, I, pp. 512ff.

Ghosh, J.C. *Aśvamēdha by the Feudatories*, IC, II, p. 140f.

Aśvamēdha and Rājasūya, IC, III, p. 763f.

Aśvamēdha by A Mughal Satrap, IC, III, p. 547f.

Gopalachari, K. *Early History of the Andhra Country*, Madras, 1941.

Gopalan, R. *History of the Pallayas of Kāñchi*, Madras, 1928.

Grierson, George A. *The Translation of the Term "Bhagavat"* JRAS, 1910, pp. 159ff.

Har Dayal *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature*, London, 1932.

Hultzsch, E. *Ipur Plates of Gōvindavarman's son Mādhavavarman*, EI, XVII, pp. 334ff.

Ipur Plates of Mādhavavarman II, EI, XVII, pp. 337ff.

Ramatirtham Plates of Indravarman, EI, XII, pp. 133ff.

Jan Yun-Hua *Nāgārjunakoṇḍa* (Note on A New Reference From Chinese Source), JIH, XLVIII, pp. 415 ff.

Jayaswal, K.P. *History of India*, 150 A.D.-350 A.D., JBORS, XIX (1933), pp. 1-222.

Jouveau-Dubreuil, G. *Amarāvatī From A.D. 100 To 700*, JAHRS, V, p. 91f.

Ancient History of the Deccan. English Translations by V.S. Swaminatha Dikshitar, Pondicherry, 1920.

The Pallavas, English Translation by V.S. Swaminatha Dikshitar, Pondicherry, 1917.

Pallava Antiquities, English translation by V.S. Swaminatha Dikshitar, Pondicherry, 1918.

Kane, P.V. *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. I to V Poona.

Keith, A.B. *The Religion And Philosphy of the Vedas And Upanishads*, 1st and 2nd halves, Harvard Ori. Series, 1925.

See also Macdonell A.A. and Keith A.B.

Khare, M.D. *Discovery of Vishṇu Temple Near the Heliodoros Pillar, Besnagar, District Vidīsha (M. P.), Lalit Kalā*, No. 13 (1967), pp. 21ff., and Plate.

Krishnan, K.G. *Traipurusha-Trikūṭa Cults in*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Karnāṭaka, QJMP, LV, pp. 53 ff

Kielhorn, F. *Chikkulla Plates of Vikramēndravarman II*, EI, IV, pp. 193ff.

A List of Inscriptions of Southern India from about A.D. 500. Appendix to EI, VII, and VIII.

Longhurst, A.H. *Pallava Architecture* (MASI), Pt. I (1924), Pt. II (1928), Pt. III (1930).

Macdonell, A.A. and Keith, A.B. *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*. Vols I and II, London 1912.

Mahalingam, T.V. *Kāñchīpuram in Early South Indian History*, Bombay, 1968.

South Indian Polity, Madras, 1955.

Mahatab, Hare Krushna *The History of Orissa*, Vols. I and II, Cuttack, 1959.

Majumdar, R.C. and Pusalkar, A D. Ed. *The Age of Imperial Unity* (The History and Culture of the Indian People), Bombay, 1951.

The Classical Age (The History and Culture of the Indian People, II Impression), Bombay, 1962.

Minakshi, C. *Administration And Social Life Under the Pallavas*, Madras, 1938.

Mirashi, V.V. Ed. *CII*. Vols. IV and V.

Fresh Light on Two New Grants of the Vishṇukuṇḍins, JIH, pp. 1ff.

Khanapur Plates of Mādhavavarman, EI. XXVII, pp. 312ff.

Mallar Plates of Mahāśivagupta, EI, XXII, pp. 113ff.

A Note on The Coins of Mahisha Kings, EI, XXXVII, pp. 45ff.

A Note on the Date of the Sōmavaṁśi Kings of Southern Kosala, EI, XXVI, pp. 227ff.

New Light on the Ancient History of Mahārāshṭra, IHC, XI (1948), pp. 49ff.

Some More Coins of the Mahisha Dynasty, JNSI, XI, pp. 1ff.

Thākurdiya Plates of Mahā-Pravararāja, EI, XXII, pp. 15ff.

OTTO Schrader, F. *The Translation of the Term 'Bhagavat'*, JRAS, 1911, p. 194.

Panchamukhi, R.S. *Tandivada Grant of Pṛithivī-Mahārāja*, EI, XXII, pp. 88ff.

Pires, E.A. *The Maukharis*, Madras, 1934.

Pusalkar, A.D. See Majumdar, R.C. and Pusalkar, A.D.

Ramachandramurti, V.S. *The Ananda-Gōtra Kings of Kandarapura*, JAHRS, XI, pp. 43ff.

Genealogy of the Vishṇukuṇḍins, JAHRS, X, pp. 187ff.

Ramesan, N. *The Māruṭūr Plates of Satyāśraya Śrī Pṛithivī-vallabha Pulakēśi II*, APGAS, No. 6 pp. 11; *Kaṭṭuchemvu Grant of Harivarma* ibid. pp. 241ff.

Rao, Krishna, B.V. *A History of the Early Dynasties of Andhradēśa*, Madras, 1942.

Revised Chronology of the Eastern Chālukya Kings, JAHRS, IX, pt. 4, pp. 1ff.

Rao, Lakshman K.V. *The Telugu Academy Plates of Vishṇukuṇḍin Mādhavavarman* III, JDL, XI, pp. 31ff.

Rao, Rama, M. *New Light on the Vishṇukuṇḍins*, JIH, XLIII, pp. 733 ff.

The Post-Āndhra Dynasties in

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

the Purāṇas (*The Bhārata War And Puranic Genealogies*, Ed. D.C. Sircar, Calcutta 1969) pp. 115ff.

The Satavahana Coins in the Andhra Pradesh Government Museum, (APGMS, No. 2), Hyderabad, 1961.

Successors of Sātavāhanas, JIH XL, pp. 357ff.

Vishṇukundin Coins in the A.P. Government Museum (APGAS, No. 10), Hyderabad, 1963.

Early History of Andhra Dēśa, JMU, XXXVIII pp. 126ff.

Rao, Sambasiva, G. *Pallava Rule over the Guntur District*, JAHRS, XXIX, pp. 73ff.

Rao, Subba, R. *Cheedivalasa Plates of Dēvēndravarman*, JAHRS, II, pp. 146ff.

Early History of North-East Deccan From Original Sources, IOC, 5th, Lahore, 1930, pp. 492ff.

Polamuru Plates of Vishṇukuṇḍin Mādhavavarman, JAHRS, VI, pp. 17ff.

Rapson, E.J. *Catalogue of the Coins of the Andhra Dynasty etc.* (*Cat. of Ind. Coins in the British Museum*, Vol. IV), London, 1908.

Indian Coins (Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research, II, Band, 3 Heft B.), Strassburg, 1898.

Ray, H.C. *The Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. I, and II, Calcutta, 1931-36.

Raychaudhuri, H.C. *Political History of Ancient India*, VI Ed. Calcutta, 1953, (Other editions are specified in respective places).

Salatore, B.A. *Ancient Karnātaka*, Vol. I (*History of the Tuḷuvas*), Poona, 1936.

Sankaranarayanan, S. "*Ākara*" *And* "*Ariake*", ABORI, LII, pp. 221ff.

Ghaṭikā, JAIH, V, pp. 256ff.

Māruṭūra Grant of Satyāśraya Pṛithivīvallabha Mahārāja (*Pulakeśi II*), year 8. Prof. P.B. Desai Felicitation Vol. *Studies in Indian History & Culture*, (Dharwar, 1971), pp. 63ff.

Historical Data in the Viśrutacharita, the *Mysore Orientalist*, IV, No. 1.

New Light On the Genealogy and Chronology of the Vishṇukuṇḍins, JOI, XVI, p. 375ff.

Ṛshika and Ākara, JAIH, IV, pp. 158ff.

The Controversial Legend of the Koṇḍapur Coins, *JNSI*, XXXIV pp. 36ff.

The Śrīparvatiya Andhras of The Purāṇas, Journal, *Purāṇa*, XIV, pp. 11ff.

Trivaranagara and the Date of the Pāṇḍava king Tīvara of South Kosala, JOI, XXIII, pp. 209 ff.

Two Vishṇukuṇḍi Charters from Tummalagudem, *EA*, II, pp. 4ff. and Plates.

Velpuru Inscription of Mādhavavarman, Year 33, EI, XXXVII, pp. 125ff.

Sarma, Somasekhara, M. *The Chronology of The Eastern Chālukyas*, JOR, IX, pp. 17ff.

Indrabhaṭṭāraka and the Gaṅga Era, JAHRS, VI, pp. 171ff.

A Note on "Daśaśatasakala-Dharaṇitala", JOR, XI, 221ff.

Sastri, *Fresh Light on the History of*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Karnāṭaka, QJMP, LV, pp. 53 ff

Kielhorn, F. *Chikkulla Plates of Vikramēndravarman II*, EI, IV, pp. 193ff.

A List of Inscriptions of Southern India from about A.D. 500. Appendix to EI, VII, and VIII.

Longhurst, A.H. *Pallava Architecture* (MASI), Pt. I (1924), Pt. II (1928), Pt. III (1930).

Macdonell, A.A. and Keith, A.B. *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*. Vols I and II, London 1912.

Mahalingam, T.V. *Kāñchīpuram in Early South Indian History*, Bombay, 1968.

South Indian Polity, Madras, 1955.

Mahatab, Hare Krushna *The History of Orissa*, Vols. I and II, Cuttack, 1959.

Majumdar, R.C. and Pusalkar, A D. Ed. *The Age of Imperial Unity* (The History and Culture of the Indian People), Bombay, 1951.

The Classical Age (The History and Culture of the Indian People, II Impression), Bombay, 1962.

Minakshi, C. *Administration And Social Life Under the Pallavas*, Madras, 1938.

Mirashi, V.V. Ed. *CII*. Vols. IV and V.

Fresh Light on Two New Grants of the Vishṇukuṇḍins, JIH, pp. 1ff.

Khanapur Plates of Mādhavavarman, EI. XXVII, pp. 312ff.

Mallar Plates of Mahāśivagupta, EI, XXII, pp. 113ff.

A Note on The Coins of Mahisha Kings, EI, XXXVII, pp. 45ff.

A Note on the Date of the Sōmavaṁśi Kings of Southern Kosala, EI, XXVI, pp. 227ff.

New Light on the Ancient History of Mahārāshṭra, IHC, XI (1948), pp. 49ff.

Some More Coins of the Mahisha Dynasty, JNSI, XI, pp. 1ff.

Thākurdiya Plates of Mahā-Pravararāja, EI, XXII, pp. 15ff.

OTTO Schrader, F. *The Translation of the Term 'Bhagavat'*, JRAS, 1911, p. 194.

Panchamukhi, R.S. *Tandivada Grant of Pṛithivī-Mahārāja*, EI, XXII, pp. 88ff.

Pires, E.A. *The Maukharis*, Madras, 1934.

Pusalkar, A.D. See Majumdar, R.C. and Pusalkar, A.D.

Ramachandramurti, V.S. *The Ananda-Gōtra Kings of Kandarapura*, JAHRS, XI, pp. 43ff.

Genealogy of the Vishṇukuṇḍins, JAHRS, X, pp. 187ff.

Ramesan, N. *The Māruṭūr Plates of Satyāśraya Śrī Pṛithivī-vallabha Pulakēśi II*, APGAS, No. 6 pp. 11; *Kaṭṭuchemvu Grant of Harivarma* ibid. pp. 241ff.

Rao, Krishna, B.V. *A History of the Early Dynasties of Andhradēśa*, Madras, 1942.

Revised Chronology of the Eastern Chālukya Kings, JAHRS, IX, pt. 4, pp. 1ff.

Rao, Lakshman K.V. *The Telugu Academy Plates of Vishṇukuṇḍin Mādhavavarman* III, JDL, XI, pp. 31ff.

Rao, Rama, M. *New Light on the Vishṇukuṇḍins*, JIH, XLIII, pp. 733 ff.

The Post-Āndhra Dynasties in

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

the Purāṇas (*The Bhārata War And Puranic Genealogies*, Ed. D.C. Sircar, Calcutta 1969) pp. 115ff.

The Satavahana Coins in the Andhra Pradesh Government Museum, (APGMS, No. 2), Hyderabad, 1961.

Successors of Sātavāhanas, JIH XL, pp. 357ff.

Vishṇukundin Coins in the A.P. Government Museum (APGAS, No. 10), Hyderabad, 1963.

Early History of Andhra Dēśa, JMU, XXXVIII pp. 126ff.

Rao, Sambasiva, G. *Pallava Rule over the Guntur District*, JAHRS, XXIX, pp. 73ff.

Rao, Subba, R. *Cheedivalasa Plates of Dēvēndravarman*, JAHRS, II, pp. 146ff.

Early History of North-East Deccan From Original Sources, IOC, 5th, Lahore, 1930, pp. 492ff.

Polamuru Plates of Vishṇukuṇḍin Mādhavavarman, JAHRS, VI, pp. 17ff.

Rapson, E.J. *Catalogue of the Coins of the Andhra Dynasty etc.* (*Cat. of Ind. Coins in the British Museum*, Vol. IV), London, 1908.

Indian Coins (Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research, II, Band, 3 Heft B.), Strassburg, 1898.

Ray, H.C. *The Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. I, and II, Calcutta, 1931-36.

Raychaudhuri, H.C. *Political History of Ancient India*, VI Ed. Calcutta, 1953, (Other editions are specified in respective places).

Salatore, B.A. *Ancient Karnātaka*, Vol. I (*History of the Tuḷuvas*), Poona, 1936.

Sankaranarayanan, S. "*Ākara*" *And* "*Ariake*", ABORI, LII, pp. 221ff.

Ghaṭikā, JAIH, V, pp. 256ff.

Māruṭūra Grant of Satyāśraya Pṛithivīvallabha Mahārāja (*Pulakeśi II*), year 8. Prof. P.B. Desai Felicitation Vol. *Studies in Indian History & Culture*, (Dharwar, 1971), pp. 63ff.

Historical Data in the Viśrutacharita, the *Mysore Orientalist*, IV, No. 1.

New Light On the Genealogy and Chronology of the Vishṇukuṇḍins, JOI, XVI, p. 375ff.

Ṛshika and Ākara, JAIH, IV, pp. 158ff.

The Controversial Legend of the Koṇḍapur Coins, *JNSI*, XXXIV pp. 36ff.

The Śrīparvatiya Andhras of The Purāṇas, Journal, *Purāṇa*, XIV, pp. 11ff.

Trivaranagara and the Date of the Pāṇḍava king Tīvara of South Kosala, JOI, XXIII, pp. 209 ff.

Two Vishṇukuṇḍi Charters from Tummalagudem, *EA*, II, pp. 4ff. and Plates.

Velpuru Inscription of Mādhavavarman, *Year 33*, EI, XXXVII, pp. 125ff.

Sarma, Somasekhara, M. *The Chronology of The Eastern Chālukyas*, JOR, IX, pp. 17ff.

Indrabhaṭṭāraka and the Gaṅga Era, JAHRS, VI, pp. 171ff.

A Note on "Daśaśatasakala-Dharaṇitala", JOR, XI, 221ff.

Sastri, *Fresh Light on the History of*

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Ajaya Mitra — *the Vishṇukuṇḍins*, JIH, XLIV, pp. 683.

Two New Varieties of Vishṇukuṇḍin Coins from Vidarbha JNSI, XXVIII, pp. 164ff.

Sastri, B.N. — *Vishṇukuṇḍina Góvindavarman Indrapālanagara Tāmraśāsanamu*, *Bhārati* (Telugu), 1965, June, pp. 14ff.

Vishṇukuṇḍina Vikramēndrabhaṭṭārakavarma Indrapālanagara Tāmraśāsanamu, ibid., 1965 July pp. 2ff.

Vishṇukuṇḍinulu Kālanirṇayamu, ibid., 1967, Nov., pp. 29ff.

Sastri, — *Colas*, Vol. I and II, Madras, 1935-37.

Nilakanta, K. A. — Ed. *A Comprehensive History of India*, Vol. II, Orient Longmans, 1956.

Foreign Notices of South India, Madras, 1939.

A History of South India, III Ed. Oxford University Press, 1966.

Studies in Cōḷa History, Madras, 1932.

The Vishṇukuṇḍins, IC, XV, pp. 13ff.

Sastri, Ramaswami, V. A. — *Janāsrayī Ghhandovichitī*, JOR, XVII, pp. 138 ff.

Sewell, R. — *List of the Antiquarian Remains of the Presidency of Madras*, Vol. I, Madras, 1882.

The Historical Inscriptions of Southern India, Ed. by S. Krishna swami Aiyangar, Madras 1932.

Sircar, D.C. — *Alleged Coins of Mahisha Kings*, EI, XXXV, pp. 69ff.

The Ānanda and Vishṇukuṇḍin Kings of Andhradēśa, JAHRS, XI, pp. 129ff.

Aśvamēdha, IC, I, pp. 331ff.

Bonda Plates of Mahāśiva Tivara, EI, XXXIV, pp. 111ff.

Brahma-Kshatriya, VIJ, I, pp. 87 ff.

Epigraphic Notes II, Genealogy of the Vishṇukuṇḍins, IHQ, IX, pp. 273ff.

Genealogy and Chronology of the Vishṇukuṇḍins, QJMS, XXV, pp. 299ff.

Importance of Aśvamēdha, IC, II, pp. 789ff.

Note on Mallēśvaram Inscription of Trailōkyamalla, EI, XXXV, pp. 261ff.

Select Inscriptions, II Ed. Calcutta, 1965.

Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India, Delhi, 1960.

Studies in the Religious Life of Ancient and Medieval India, Delhi, 1971.

Studies in the Society and Administration of Ancient and Medieval India, Calcutta, 1967.

The Successors of Sātavāhanas in Lower Deccan, Calcutta, 1939.

Tūṇḍigrama Grant of Vikramēndravarman II, Year 14, EI, XXXVI, pp. 7ff.

Vishṇukuṇḍins and Mr. S.V. Viśwanātha, QJMS, XXVII, pp. 231ff.

Sivarama murti C. — *Early Eastern Chālukyan Sculpture*, BMGM, 1957.

Smith, V.A. — *Early History of India*, IV Ed., Oxford, 1924.

Soundara Rajan, K. V. — *Architecture of the Early Hindu Temples of Andhra Pradesh*, APGAS, No. 21, 1965.

Sovani, V. V. — *The Translation of the Term "Bhagavat"*, JRAS 1910, pp. 863 ff.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Srinivasan, K.R. *Cave Temples of the Pallavas* (ASI, Arch. Survey of Temples, No. 1), New Delhi, 1964.

Srinivasan, P.R. *Beginning of the Traditions of South Indian Temple Architecture*, BMGM, 1957.

Subramanian, K.R *Buddhist Remains in Andhra and The History of Andhra between 225 and 610 A.D.*, Madras, 1932.

Parvata, JAHRS, X, pp. 100 ff.

Subrahmanyam, R. *A Catalogue of the Ikshvāku Coins in the Andhra Pradesh Govt. Museum* (APGMS, No. 5), Hyderabad, 1962.

The Tūṇḍi Copper Plate Grant of Vishṇukuṇḍiṇ King Vikramēndravarman (APGAS, No. 8), Hyderabad, 1962.

Sur, Atul K. *Were the Bharaśivas Really Paramount Sovereigns?* IC, I, p. 114,f.

Svami, Govindacharya, A. *The Translation of the Term "Bhagavat"*, JRAS, 1910, pp. 861ff,

Syama Sundaram, K. *Further Light on the Genealogy and the Chronology of the Vishṇukuṇḍins*, JAHRS, XXXI, pp. 39ff.

The Tamil History Academy (Madras). *Thirty Pallava Copper-Plates*, Madras, 1966.

Tripathi, R.S. *History of Kanauj*, Benares, 1937.

Vaidyanathan, K.S. *The History of the Vishṇukuṇḍins*, QJMS, XXX, pp. 54ff., 308ff. XXXI, pp. 13ff.

A Note on the Godavari Grant of Pṛithivīmūla, ASVOI, I, pt. ii, (1940), pp. 87ff.

Velankar, H.D. *Jānāśrayī And Prāterit metres* JBBRAS (NS), XXXI-XXXII, pp. 277ff.

Venkataramanayya, N. *The Eastern Cālukyas of Vèṅgī*, Madras, 1950.

Karṇāṭa, JAHRS, X, pp. 89-99.

Mahēndravarman I and Puḷakēśin II, Srī Gidugu Venkataramamurti Pantulu Commemoration Vol. 1933, pp. 97ff.

Viswanatha, S.V. *The Vishṇukuṇḍins*, QJMS, XXV, pp. 75ff.; XXVI, pp. 142ff.

Watters, T. *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Ed. by T.W. Rhys Davis and S.W. Bushell, Vols. I and II, London. 1904-05.

Yazdani, G. Ed. *Early History of the Deccan* Vols. I and II, Oxford, 1960.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

INDEX

The following abbreviations are used in this index: *adj.*=adjective; *au.*=author; *Bud.*= Buddhist; C=Central; *ca.*=capital; *ch.*=chief; *Chā.*=Chālukya; *char*=charter; *chara*=character; *ci.*=city; *cl.*=class or clan; *co.*=country; *com.*=commentary; *cte.*=caste; *d.*=day; *desi.*= designation; *di.*=division; Dt.=district; *dy.*=dynasty; E.=East or Eastern; *edn*=educational; *ep.*=epithet; *exp.*=explained; *fa.*=family; *fa. n.*=family name; *feu.*=feudatory; *g.*=god or goddess; *gen.*=general; *geo.*=geographical; *gram.*=grammatical; *grt.*=grant; *h.q.*=headquarter; *id.*=identified; *inst.* =institution; *k.*=king; *l.*=locality; *la.*=language; *lit.*=literature or literary; *l.m.*=land or linear mearure; *m*=male; *matr*=matronymic; *Mau.*=Maukhari; *min*=minister; *mon*=monastery; *mt.*=mountain; *myth.*=mythology or mythological; *n.*=name; *off.*=office or official; *Pal.*=Pallava; *Pāṇ*=Pāṇḍava; *peo.* =people; *ph.*=philophy or philosopher; *pls.*=plates; *pl.*=place; *p. n.*=personal name; *pr.*=prince or princess; *Pṛi.*=Pṛithivimūla; *priv.*= privilege; *prov.*=province or provincial; *pt.*=part; *q.*=queen; *Rāsh.*=Rāshṭrakūṭa; rd=record or records; *reg*=region; *rel.*=religion or religious; *ri.*=river; *ro*=royal; S.=South; *sac.*= sacrifice or sacrificial; *Śail*=Śailōdbhava; *Śara*=Śarabhapuriya; *Sāta.*=Sātavāhana; *sect.*= section; *Skt.*=Sanskrit; *st.*=state; *sym*=symbol; *sys*=system; *t.d.*=territorial division; te.= temple; *tit*=title; tk.=taluk; *tn.*=town; *tr.*=tribe; *t.t.*=technical term; *Vā.*=Vākātaka *vi.*= village; *Vish.*=Vishṇukuṇḍi; W.=West or Western; *w.*=woman; *wk.*=work; *wr.*=wrong; *y.*=year.

A

Abhihita, meanings of, 204
Abhihita, n. of. ch. 203
Abhihita, n. of. te., 117, 149, 202-03
abhijana, Bud. t.t. six of, 172 175
Abhimanyu, *Rāsh. k.* 53, 57-58
Abhimukha, sur n., 204
abhiprajāta, prajāta, meaning and usage of, 173, 175
abhiprasāda, Bud. t.t. 172, 175
Ābhīra, *cl.* 21
Ābhīra, *dy.* 22, 205-06, 208-09
Abhira ins. 22
abhisandhi-sahāya 'agreement for help', 122
Ābhōga, *wk.*, 238
Ablative case, 203
ach., Skt. suffix., 28
Achala, *i.e.*, Śiva, *g.*, 127
Achalā, *i.e.*, Pārvarī, *g.*, 127
Achalēśvara, *s a.* Kapōtēśvara, *g.*, 116-17, 127, 142, 150, 202
Āchārya, tit., 35, 202
a-chāṭa-bhaṭa-pravēśa, priv., 132
Achyutapuram pls. of Indravarman II, *y.* 87, 99, 108
adharma (or *kūṭa*) *yuddha*, 'treacherous battle' 135, 140
adhikaraṇa, di. of. wk., 145
adhikāra-purusha, off., 179, 198
Adhikārin, Ādhikārika, off., 131
Adhirāja, *exp. as n.*, 62
adhirāja, meaning of, 76
adhirāja, tit., 92, 99, 101
adhirājya, 'kingdom' 176
adhitishṭhan, meaning of, 117
adhivāsaka, 192
adhvāna, 'desolate place' 110, 115, 195-96
adhvānamu s.a. a-dhvāna, 196
adhyāpana, duty, 161
adhyayana, duty, 161
Ādityasvāmin, *donee*, 195
Ādityavarman, *Mau. k.* 79
ādi-vṛiddhi, gram. term, 20-21, 27
agamyā-gamana, sin, 214
Agastya, *sage*, 233
Agastya, *star*, 244
agni, n., 20
Agnichayana, sac. 145
Agnikula-Kshatriya etc., 24
Agni-kuṇḍa 'fire altar', 20
Agnipurāṇā, wk., 205
Agniśarman, donee, 46, 61, 62 160, 164
Agnishṭōma, sac. 4, 159, 190, 214
Agnishṭōmasahasra, sac., 2, 6, 9, 46, 61, 164, 213-14, 224
Agnishtōmasahasra-yājin. ep., 164, 214
Agnishṭōma-saṁstha, sac., 214
Agnisvāmin, *donee*, 100
Āgnivēśya, *gōtra*, 195
agrahāra, gift, 94, 103-04, 137, 166, 179, 183, 188, 190, 192
agrahāra-bhōga-nyāya, 196
agramahishī, 'chi q', 39
Āguptāyika, *era*, 53
Ahīna, sac., 215, 218, 222
Aihole, *l.*, 148, 149
Aihole *praśasti*, 15, 28, 78, 86, 88, 111, 113-16, 122-23, 125-26, 158, 160, 180
Aikshvākava, *i.e.*, Ikshvāku, *dy.* 207, 209

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Aila, *ruling cl.*, 209
Aindavī, 'of Indu', 88
Aira, *fa*, 23
Airāvata, *myth. elephant*, 68
Aitarēya Brāhmaṇa, Vēdic di., 220
Aitarēyāraṇyaka, Vedic di., 151
Aja, *lit. hero*, 221
Ajamīḍha, *myth. k.*, 26
Ajaṇṭā, *l.*, 148
Ajanta Cave ins. of Varāhadēva, 27, 42, 48, 53, 61, 64
Ajjhitabhaṭṭarikā, *Kuntala pr.*, 43, 54, 59
āj̃ñā, āj̃ñāpanā, āj̃ñapti, off, 3, 5, 38, 49, 56, 80-81, 96, 98, 103-04, 131, 160, 164, 166, 174, 177, 181, 191-92, 199
āj̃ñā, āj̃ñāpana, āj̃ñāpti 'order' 62, 120, 128, 177
Akalaṅkattuvarayar (-yuvarāja), *p. n.*. 120
Ākara, *co.*, 31-32, 41
'Ākarāvantī', 41
Āki, Ākivīḍu, *vi.*, 81-82, 177
akshayya-phala i.e., mōksha, 110, 195
Allahabad *praśasti* of Samudragupta, 27
Altekar, 42, 51
Āḷuka, Āḷupa, *co.*, 111, 113
Āḷuka, Āḷupa, Āḷuva, *dy.*, 115 125
Alukamaharaja, *Āḷupa ch.* 110-11, 116, 123, 125, 195
Amalānanda, *au.*, 144
Amarapadavivṛiti, wk., 139
Amarapura, *ci. of gods*, 188
'Amarapura', wr. reading of 'Kudūrapura' 18, 27, 62, 65, 165
'Amarapura' *id.* Amarāvatī, 62
Amarāvatī, *Bud. site*, 18, 28, 62, 119, 142, 146
Amaravati ins. 18, 35
Ambikā, *i.e.* Pārvatī, *g.*, 141
Amma II, *E. Chā. k.* 80, 239
Amroati, *l.*, 27
Anādṛishṭikāḍa, p.n., 22
ānaka 'war drum', 45
ānaka-sthāpanā, rite, 157
Ānanda, *dy.*, 31, 49-50, 63-65, 82, 118-19, 121, 126-27, 137, 231, 232, 234
Ānanda, *gōtra*, 103
Ānanda-maharshi, *sage*, 117, 200
Ānanda records, 118
Ānanda territory, 124
Anaṅgabhīma III *E. Gaṅga k.* 57, 221
Anantapur reg., 129
Anantapur Dt. 23, 205
Anantavarman, *Mau. k.* 73
Anantavarman Chōḍagaṅga, *E. Gaṅga k.*, 127
an-ārya 'base born' 30
Andhra, adj. 209
Andhra, Andhradēśa, co., 6-8, 10, 14, 18-19, 24, 31, 35, 39, 41, 43-44, 52-53, 55, 61, 64, 70-72, 74, 76, 78-79, 86-87, 113-15, 136, 142-47, 227, 231-34
Andhra C., *di.*, 49, 64
Andhra, Coastal. *di.*, 80, 118
Andhra *E. di.*, 50
Andhra, N. *di.*, 134
Andhra, S., *di.*, 134
Andhra empire, 233
Andhra, *cl.* or *peo.* 24, 26, 136, 205, 207-08
Andhra, *dy.*, 19, 23, 26, 29-30, 72, 76, 207, 209
Andhra, *k.*, 24, 25, 207
Andhra, meaning of, 24
Andhra, tit., 19, 25, 207
Andhra kingdom, 40
Andhra-Maukhari conflict, 73
Andhra-Orissa border, 73
Andhrapati, Andhrādhipati, tit., 19, 24-25, 71-74, 78-79
Andhra Sātavāhana, *dy.*, 24, 50
Andhra women, cosmetics etc. of, 137
Andhrī, Andhra-sundarī or lady, 117, 126, 200, 233
anēka-chāturdanta, etc., *ep.*, 97
Aṅga, *cl.*, 21
Aṅga, *co.*, 113
Aṅga, *myth. k.*, 25
aṅgas of the state, 132
Antaka, *g. of death*, 175
Anu, *myth. k.*, 25
Ānukūra, *vi.*, 183
Anūpa, *co.*, 32
anuprāsa 'alliteration', 203
Anuśāsanaparvan pt. of MB, 220
Anushṭubh metre, 153, 158, 180
anusvāra, due to Prākṛit influence, 160
anuttaram puṇya-kshētram, ep. 154, 156
Aparānta reg., 232
Apararka, wk., 139
Apasmārapurusha, *demon*, 148
Āpastamba, *au.*, 220
Āpastamba-Śrauta-sūtra wk., 81, 144, 177, 214
apavāda, exceptional rule, 209
Aphsad ins., 79
Appāyika, *military adventurer*, 113
Appayyadīkshita, *au.*, 144, 223
Aptōryāma, sac., 214
apūrva-datti, gift, 138, 140, 181
Āraṅg, *l.*, 227
Arang pls. of Bhīmasēna II, 226-28
Arjjuna, *epic. hero*, 198, 216
Arthapatibhaṭṭāraka, *Nala k.* 71, 78, 82
artha-Śāstra 'politics' 135
Arthaśāstra, wk., 168, 239
Arundhatī, *myth. chara.* 195
Arya-vara-bhikshu-saṅgha, i.e., Bud. *saṅgha* 38, 154, 173
Asaka, *s. a*, Aśmaka, *co.*, 31, 41
Asanapura, *l.*, 74-75, 112
Ashṭādhyāyī, wk., 152
Ashṭaṅga-yōga, 152
asidhāra-nishkraya, 'reward for the heroism of sword', 97
Asika *s.a.* Ṛishika, co., 31, 41
Asikanagara, *s.a.* Ṛishikanagara, *ci.*, 42
Aśīti-dvaya or *Dvyaśīti, s.a. Taittirī-yaśākhā*, 152
Aśīti-tārka, Aśīti-tarka, i.e., the *Tarkaśāstra*, 145

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Aśīti-tārkaka, tit.., 145, 195, 198
Aśmaka, *co.*, 31, 41, 53, 58
Aśoka, *Mauryan k.*, 32, 240, 241
āśrama, four divisions of, 136
Asura princess, 212
aśva, ro. insignia, 243
aśvādhyaksha, off., 238
Aśvaghōsha, *poet*, 27
Āśvalāyana Grihyasūtra, wk., 57
Aśvamēdha, sac. 2-5, 9-11, 13-14, 34, 46-48, 50, 52, 54, 61, 65, 80, 85, 88, 117-18, 142, 159, 163-64, 166, 169, 172, 176, 178, 215-24, 226, 242
Aśvamēdhaparvan, di. of M.B. 215-16, 218
Aśvamēdhayājin, ep., 198, 204
Āśvamēdhika, d. of sac. 214
Aśvarakshaka, off., 238
aśvasaṁstha, off., 146, 238
Ātharvaṇika 'of Atharvaṇa vēda' 94, 183
Atharvavéda, 97, 144
atibala, i.e., Pulakēśi II, *chāl k*, 123
Atirātra, sac., 214
ātmanēpada, gram. t.t., 42
a-traivarṇika, 136
Attivarman, *Ānanda k.*, 49, 118, 127
attuvānam, s.a. a-dhvāna, 196
atyanta-bhagavad-bhaktā, tit., 37
Audumbara, dy. n.. 27
aupachārika-prayōga, 27
aupadhika, Bud. t.t., 154, 156
Aurangabad Dt., 147
avabhṛitha, rite, 160-61, 164, 166, 169, 172, 176, 178
Avanibhājana, tit., 116-18, 202
Avanibhājana-Pallavēśvara, *n* 151
Avanijanāśraya, tit., 91
Avanijanāśraya Pulakēśi, *W. Chā. pr.*, 91
Avanimuḷuduḍaiyal, *Chōla q.*, 203
Avanitalāntavatī, *Ānanda pr.*, 117, 137, 200
Avantī, *co.*, 32, 41, 61
āvaraṇa, Bud. t.t., two of, 156
avasita', different meanings of, 241-43
avasita-vividha-divya, ep., 178, 241-44
Avasita-vividha+++ratiḥ. ep. 83, 243-44
āvēnika-dharma, Bud. t.t., eighteen of 143, 154-55
avi, 'pain', 29
Avidhēya, *Rāsh. k.*, 53, 57
Ayōdhyā, *ca.*, 207
āyudha, 209
āyudhajīvin, 207, 209
Ayyanamahādēvī *E. Chā. q.*, 144
Ayyapa, *Vēṇgī ch.*, 239

B

Bādāmi, *ca.*, 72-73, 110, 112, 114
Badami ins. of Śaka 465, 70
Bādarāyaṇa, *au.*, 26, 152
Bahuhiraṇya, sac., 222
Bahusuvarṇa, sac., 46, 48, 161, 163, 169, 172, 176, 214-15
Bahusuvarnaikādaśa, i.e., eleven *Bahusuvarṇas, sac.*, 213-14
Bahuvrīhi, compound, 127, 197
bala, Bud. t.t. ten of, 143
Balaghat pls., 51-2, 58, 72
Balasvāmin, *donee*, 46, 161
Bali, *myth. k.*, 25, 26
Bali, demon or 'powerful', 93
Baloda pls. 228
Bāṇa, *f.*, 129
Bāṇa, Bāṇabhaṭṭa, *poet*, 30, 32, 44, 73, 146, 221, 241-43
Banavāsi, *ca.*, 220
Banavāsi, *co.*, 53-54
Banavasi rd., 21-22, 34, 42
Bandar tk., 57
Bangalore Dt., 100
Bappa, Bappabhaṭṭāraka, 'father', 117, 127
Bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-pādānudhyāta, ep., 202
Barabanki Dt., 71
Barnet, L.D., 24
Basham, A.L., 16
Basim pls. of Vindhyaśakti, 35, 144
Bastar-Jeypor reg., 71, 78
Bāuka, *Pratihāra k.*, 211
Bay of Bengal, 49, 130
Belavāṭikā, *garden*, 162
Belgaum Dt., 53
Bellary Dt., 232
Bellary-Kurnool reg., 78
Beṇṇanātha, ep., 126
Bengal, *st.*, 73
Berar, *di.*, 71
Bēsnagar, *l.*, 149
Besnagar ins. 42
Betul Dt., 114
Bhāga, Bhāgadhēya, tax, 133
Bhagadatta Jalhaṇa, *au.*, 204
Bhagavat, ep., 153-54, 159, 164, 166, 169-72, 176, 178, 188, 221, 223
Bhagavat, i.e., Vishṇu, 37
Bhāgavata Purāṇa, 25-26
Bhairavakonda, hill n., 20
Bhāmatī, wk., 175
Bhandak ins. of Nanna, 226-27
Bhandarkar. D. R. 24, 28, 99, 184
Bhandarkar. R.G., 206
Bhānugupta, *Gupta k.*, 228
Bhānuji Dīkshita, *au* , 168
Bharadajiputa, matr., 33
Bharadvāja, *myth. chara.*, 25, 30, 211
Bhāradvāja, *gōtra*, 30, 33, 46, 117-18, 161, 195, 202
Bharaśiva Nāga, *fa.*, 54, 216
Bharata, *epic k.*, 25, 218, 223
Bhāratavarsha, 216
Bhārata war era, 111
Bhāravi, *poet*, 14, 91
Bhartṛipaṭṭa, *Guhila k.*, 30
bhāryā, ro. insignia, 243
Bhāskara, (the Sun), 161
Bhaṭa, off., 132, 137, 155
Bhaṭarka, *Maitraka k.*, 76
Bhāṭṭachandrikā, wk., 30,
Bhāṭṭadīpikā, wk., 222
bhaṭṭagrāma, gift vi., 137, 162-63
bhaṭṭāraka, n. ending, 78
Bhava, *s.a.* Śiva, 21
Bhavabhūti, *poet*, 141, 216
Bhavadattavarman, *Nala k.*, 71, 77-78, 82
Bhavadēva Raṇakēsarin, *Pāṇ. k.*, 226, 227
bhavana, 'temple', 117

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

bhāvanā, Bud. t.t., three of, 154, 156
Bhavaśarman, *donee*, 103, 191
Bhavishya, *Rāsh. k.*, 53
Bhavishya, Purāṇic sect., 24-25, 207
bhēdopāya, 113
Bhīmā, Bhīmarathī, *ri.*, 53, 113-14, 130
Bhīmasēna II, *S. Kōsala k.*, 226-28
Bhīmasvāmin, *donee*, 195
Bhīmavaram tk., 82, 103
Bhōga, tax, 133
Bhōgavardhana, pl. n. 22
Bhōkardan cave te., 147
Bhōrusvāmin, *donee*, 195
Bhramarāmbā, *g.*, 205
bhūri-bhu, 'the moon' or 'the vast earth', 180
Bhṛigu, *gōtra*, 104, 192
Biccavolu, *l.*, 150
Bihar, *st.*, 227
Bindu Saras, *lake*, 240
biruda, 243
Bobbili tk., 66, 102, 104
Bōdhāyana-Gṛihyasūtra, wk., 180
Bodh-Gaya ins. of Mahānāman, 227
Bōdhicharyāsamuchchaya, wk. 143
Bōdhichitta, Bud. t.t., 142
Bōdhichittavivaraṇa, wk., 175
Bōdhichittōtpāda, Bud. t.t., 134 155
Bōdhisattva, doctrine of, 142
Bōdhisattva-yāna, Bud. sect, 143
Bombay Presidency, 118
Bombay side, 231
Bonda pl., 226
Brahmā, *g.*, 142, 150
brāhma, brahmā, 'best', 172, 175
Brahmādhirāja, *off.*, 30, 76
Brahmaduvarāja, tit., 128
Brahma-kanyā, 211
Brahmakshatra, meaning of, 25
Brahma-kshatra, (-vaṁśa) *fa* , 26, 29-30, 211-12
Brahmakshatra-kulōdbhava, tit 26
Brahmakshatrōttara, ep., 25
Brahmakshatratējōbhṛit, ep., 24-5, 172
Brahmakuṇḍi, *s.a.* Guṇḍlakamma, *ri.*, 20
Brāhmaṇa, *cte.*, 24-26, 29-30, 34-35, 42, 46, 61, 65, 67, 74, 81, 83, 85, 96, 99-100, 104, 110, 112, 120, 135-36, 159, 161, 163, 166, 211, 237
Brāhmaṇa Vēdic di., 25, 145, 217
Brāhmaṇa-Kshatriya matrimonial relationship, 212
Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa, wk., 205
brāhmaṇ-ōpēta-kshatriyas, 25
brāhma-puṇya, 'best rel. merit', 142
Brahmapurī, *gift*, 236-37
brahma-siddhi, 237
brahma-tējas, 25
Brahmavaṁśīyas, 'Brāhmaṇas', 25
Brahmayuva-(*or* duva)rāja, *off.*, 118, 120
Brahminhood, 25
Bṛihadāraṇyakōpanishad, 218 223
Bṛihad-Bāṇa, *feu.*, 35
Bṛihadratha, *Maurya k.*, 30
Bṛihaspati, *myth. chara.*, 25, 198, 211
Bṛihatī-sahasra, collection of Vedic hymns, 145
Bṛihatkathāmañjarī, wk., 57, 230
Bṛihatphalāyana, *f.*, 62, 136
Bṛihatphalāyana, *gōtra*, 103
Bṛihatsaṁhitā, wk., 31-32
British Museum Prakrit Char. of Chārudēvī, 3, 6
Buddha, *rel. teacher*, 38-40, 61, 97, 142-43, 154
Buddha, a definition of, 143
Buddha chaitya 149
Buddhist, Buddhism, *rel.*, 9-10, 36, 38-40, 44, 55, 61, 81, 84, 95-96, 98, 130, 141-43, 146, 148
Buddhist architecture, 149
Buddhist cave, 163
Buddhist *chaitya*, evolution of its apsidal plan, 148-49
Buddhist Literature, 100, 241
Buddhist monasteries, 142
Buddhist rock-cut *chaityas*, 148
Budha, *i.e*, Mercury, 180
Buguda pls. 27
Bühler, 22, 28, 206, 209
bull, humped, standing, *emblem on the seal*, 176
bull, *figure on the coin*, 134
bull and a cow, figures of, 204
Burgess, Jas, 128, 205

C

Cape Comorin, 240
Ceylon, *co*,, 95, 143
Chāhamana, *dy.*, 128
chaitya, derivation of, 149
chaitya-gṛiha, 143
chaitya-hall type, 149
chaitya window, 142
chakra, figure on the coin, 134
chakra, ro. insignia, 243
Chakravartti-kshētra, 89, 172, 239-40, 243
Chakravartti-kshetra, two of, 130
Chakravartti-kshētra S., *s.a*, South India, 54, 71, 240, 243
chakravartin 'emperor', 240, 243
Chaḷukki araśar, *i.e*, Chālukya Vikramaditya II, 125
Chāḷukya, *dy.*, 1, 5-8, 10, 14, 23, 70, 72, 74, 100, 111-20, 122-28, 135, 146-47, 194, 198
Chāḷukya, E. *dy.*, 5-6, 8-9, 67, 74, 86, 90-91, 97, 99, 104, 111-12, 118, 121, 144, 145 147, 152, 234, 239
Chāḷukya, W., *dy.*, 15, 48, 57, 58, 72, 78, 84, 86-91, 108, 129, 135, 140, 148, 158, 227
Chāḷukya, later, *dy.*, 42, 216, 236
Chāḷukyan cave-temples, 148
Chālukyan genealogy, 113
Chālukyan records, 28, 86
Chālukyan, E. records, 125
chamū, 'army', 135
Chāmuṇḍarāja, *min.*, 30
Chamūpurā, *l.*, 81, 82, 135, 140, 177

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

chamūpurā, meanings of, 135
Chanda Dt., 92, 227
chandana, tree, 233
Chaṇḍasāti, *Sāta. k.*, 208
Chandragupta Maurya, *Mauryan k.*; 32
Chandragupta II *Vikramāditya, Gupta k.*, 36-37, 55, 92
Chandraguptapaṭṇa, *l.*, 55, 59, 205
Chandraprabha, *ph.*, 205
Chandrāvaṭi, *s.a.* Prabhavatīguptā, *Vākāṭaka q.*, 36-37, 59
Channapaṭṇa, *tn.*, 100
Chantamula (Śāntamūla), *n.*, 108
Chantamula II, *Ikshvāku k.*, 34
Chāra, off., 132, 155, add.
Chāra-bhaṭa-dūta-vallabha-rājapurushair=apravēśya, prv. 155
Charakasaṁhita, wk., 175
Chārudēvī, *Pal. q.*, 3, 6
Chāṭa, off., 132, 137
chāturdanta, exp. as Airāvata, 68
chāturdanta, chāturdanta-samara-saṅgrāma, 'battle of elephants', 68-71, 95, 100-01 166, 169, 172, 177, 183, 185, 188
chāturvarṇya-chāturāśramya-dharma-karma-sētu, ep., 161
chatur-vēda-vid, tit., 195
chatuḥshashṭi, arts, 145-46, 161, 163
chatuḥshashṭi-Śāstṛi, tit., 161
chatushpratyaya, Bud. t t., 95, 186
Chēdi, *dy.*, 33
Chellur pls. of Vīra Chōḍa, 243
Chezerla, *vi.*, 85, 116, 117, 119, 127, 136, 148-49, 200
Chezerla, reg., 64
Chezerla ins. (rd), 58, 116, 118, 119, 121-22, 137-38, 146, 231, 234,
Chezerla te., 141, 150
Chhandōga, *Vedic school*, 46
Chhandōga 'student of Sāmavēda', 144-45, 161, 163, 191
Chhāndōgyōpanishad, 26
Chhandōvichiti, wk., 144
Chicacole pls. of Guṇārṇava's son Dēvēndravarman, 189
Chicacole pls. of Indravarman, 189
Chicacole pls. of Indravarman III, y. 99, 128, 198
Chikkulla, *vi.*, 23, 169
Chikkula pls., 1-5, 8-9, 11-16, 18, 37-38, 45, 60, 67, 80, 81, 83-85, 92, 141, 147, 150, 153, 214, 219, 224, 225
Chikkulla pls., seal of, 84
Chīna, *co.*, 44
Chinese traditions, 17
Chingleput Dt., 57
Chintāmaṇi, *lit. chara.*, 242
chityā, 'fire worshipped' 149
Chōḷa, *dy.*, 79, 109, 127, 203
Chōḷa, *ruling cl.*, 21
Chōḷa empire, 57
Chōḷiya, *co.*, 113
chōra-drōhaka-varjam, exemption to priv., 132
Chōṭanāgpur, *l.*, 73
Chulamula, *n.*, 108
Chulukiki, *s.a. Chū., dy.*, 15
Chuḷukkin *wr.* for Chuḷukiki, 15
Chuṭu, Chuṭukula, Chuṭu Sātakarṇi, *cl., dy.* 19, 21-24, 28-29, 33-35, 42, 205, 207-09
Chuṭu coins 22-23, 29
Chuṭu ins., 22
Chuṭuka s.a. Chutu, fa. n. 29
Chutukaḍa, *l.*, 28
Chuṭukaḍa 'p.n., 28
Chuṭukaḍa, 'city of the Chuṭus' 22
Chuṭukaḍānanda, wr. reading for *Chuṭukulānanda*, 22
Chuṭukula, cl. n., 28
Chuṭukula, 'p.n.', 28-29
Chutukulānanda 'p.n.' 28
Chutukulānanda, tit., 21-22, 33
Chuṭu Sātakarṇi *dy.*, 1, 19, 42
Chuṭu-Vishṇukuṇḍi connection, 23
Chūyipāka, *vi.*, 94, 101, 183
Coomaraswamy, Ananda K., 29
Coromaṇḍal Coast 209
Council of ministers, 131
Cowel, 221
C.P., 114
Crescent, symbol on the seal, 176
Cuddapah tk., 232
Cuddapah Dt., 232
Cuttack Dt., 90, 104-05

D

dakshiṇā, sac. fee, 214-15, 218 222
Dakshiṇa Kōsala, *ce.*, 52
Dakshiṇa-Mātariśvā, 'Southern wind' 233
Dakshiṇāpatha, Deccan, 54, 174, 240, 243
Dākshiṇātya-samīra 'Southren wind', 233
Daḷavānūr cave, 148
Dālhaṇa, *au.*, 175
Daḷiyavāvi, *i.e.*, Tulayabhāgāri., 85-86, 179
Dāmaśarman, *Brāhmaṇa*, 85, 112, 179, 199
Damōdara Gupta, *Later Gupta k.*, 72
Damōdarasarman, *Brāhmaṇa*, 192
Damōdaravarman, *Ānanda k.*, 49, 118-19
dāna, one of the six fold duties, 161
Dāna, tax 133
Dānārṇava *E. Chā. k.*, 92
Dānārṇava, *E. Gaṅga k.*, 47, 102, 189
Daṇḍa., fine, 133
daṇḍaka, composition, 88-89
Daṇḍin, *poet*, 35, 42, 132, 139
Dantapura, *Kaliṅga, ca.*, 100 102, 188
Dantidurga, *Rāsh. k.*, 113
Dantimukha, *i.e.*, Vināyaka, *g.*, 157-58
Dantivarman, *Pal. k.*, 26
Darśa, sac., 27
darśana, i.e., philosophy, 145
daśa-balas Bud. t.t., 154-55
Daśakumāra charita, wk., 35, 42, 70
Daśaratha, *epic k.*, 216
Daśārṇa, *s.a.*, E. Malwa, *co.*, 32
daśa-śata-sakala-dharanī-tala,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

i.e., *Chakravartti-kshetra*, 239, 143
daśa-śata-sakala-dharnī-tala-narapati 89, 178, 239
Daśāsvamēdha, 54
dāyādas, 'kinsmen' 63, 65, 70, 172
days of bright fortnight:
7th, 65
7th (of Vā pa) 62, 164
8th, 104
9th, 120, 128
10th, 160
15th, 10, 16, 46
ashṭami 173, 193
saptamī, 167
Mahānavamī (Āśvina śu. 9) 128
Mahānavamī, (Kārttika su. 9) 120, 128
Mahāvaiśākhī Paurṇamāsī. Pūrṇimā, 46, 162-63
Paurṇamāsī, 154, 191
Phālgunī Pūrṇimā, *Paurṇamāsī*, 86, 179
Full-moon day, 20, 39, 45, 85, 163
days of dark fortnight:
3rd (of Gi. 8), 112, 199
3rd (of the Vāsa 4) 94, 183
5th (Giṁha 8), 80, 170-71
8th, 81, 83
15th, 110
Pratipad (of Gi. 2), 81, 177
Amāvāsī,-vāsyā (15th), 195,
Days of month:
15th of Kārttika, 103
21st, Vaiśākha, 100, 189
Days of the week:
Sunday, 86, 163
Tuesday, 87
Wednesday, 86-87
Thursday, 87, 120
Saturday, 86
Bṛihaspativāra, 120
Deccan, *di.*, 1, 48, 51, 70-71, 81, 219. 225, 240
Deccan, E., *di.*, 70, 110-11, 115, 118, 120
Deccan, W., 48, 54
Dejjamahārāja, *Rāsh. k.*, 53
Dendalūru, camping place, 80, 169
dēśa, di, 130, 132
dēśanā, 'sermon', 172, 175
Dēśavibhāga, chapter, 240
dēva, 'king', 220
dēvādhidēva, dēvātidēva, tit., 220-21
dēva-gaṇa, 170
Devagiri pls. of Mṛigēśavarman, 168
dēvakarmin, te., off., 137, 202
Dēvarāja, *Rāsh. k.*, 53, 55
Dēvasēna II, *Vā. k.*, 48, 53, 55, 61
Dēvasiṁhadēva, *min.*, 100
Dēvasiṅgha (-siṁha), *off.*, 189
Dēvatā-kāṇḍa, wk., 146
Dēva te., 142
dēvātidēva, ep., 139, 176
dēvat-ōpasanā, 'worship of deities', 141
Dēvavarman, *Vish. pr.*, 2-8, 13, 24, 53, 55, 56, 61-62, 130, 164
Dēvayānī, *epic chara.*, 211
Dēvēndravarman, *E. Gaṅga k.*, 189
Dey, N. 29
dh, Pal. and Chā. types of, 116
Dhammapada, wk., 156
Dhaṁñakaḍa, *i.e.*, Dhānyakaṭa, 28
Dhanagiri, p.n., 22
Dhanakaḍa *i.e.* Dhānyakaṭa, 22, 119
Dhanus, *sign of zodiac*, 163
Dhānyakaṭa, *prov. h q.*, 62, 123, 127, 200
Dhānyakaṭa, 'corporation of warriors from Dhanyakaṭ, *co.*' 127
Dhānyakaṭa, —kaṭaka, *ca.*, 119, 127-28, 142
Dharaṇikōṭa, *l.*, 119
Dharasēna, *Traikūṭaka k.*, 52
dharma, 'law of ethics', 216
dharma, 'law of succession', 140, 189
dharma, code of, 135
Dharmarājaratha ins. at Mahābalipuram, 116
Dharmasaṅgraha, wk., 143
Dharmaśāstra, lit., 104, 145, 192, 242
Dharmaśāstra, 'principle of morality', 135
dharma-śūnyatā, i.e., non-existence of the objective world, 143
Dharmavijayin, tit., 135, 173, 186
Dharwar Dt., 232
Dhātuvṛitti, wk., 93
Dhēnukākaḍa, *l.*, 28
Dhṛitimān, *fire g.*, 27
Dhruvarāja Indravarman, *W. Chā. pr.*, 113, 120
dhuta (*dhūta*)-*guṇa, Bud. t.t.*, twelve of, 154, 156
Dhuṭukaḷānanda, wr. reading for *Chuṭukulānanda*, 22
dhyāna, Bud. t.t., four stages of, 154, 156
di. i.e., ḍine, 160, 164, 199
Dīghanikāya, wk., 156
digvijaya, 52, 114
dik-chhabda, 'word denoting a point of compass', 41
dikshā, sac. rite, 214
Dilīpa, *epic k.*, 217
dīpa-chakkavatti, dvīpa-chakra varttin, 'emperor', 241
Diṭṭham, ḍrishṭam, 'seen', *t.t.*, 157-58
Divākarasvāmin, *donee*, 195
divine origin (of kingship), 130
divya, 'insignia of royalty', 243
divya, 'ordial', 135-36
divya, different forms of, 242-43
Divyāvadāna, wk., 174
Drākshārāma, *l.*, 46, 57
Draṁila, *co.*, 113
Draviḍa, *co.*, 234
Draviḍian, *la.*, 28-29, 232-33, 238
Dravidian, *race*, 29
Dubreuil, 3, 6, 15, 28-29, 35, 53, 55, 62, 68, 84-85, 88, 129, 134, 147, 152
Durgā te., 149
Durgāsaptaśatī, hymn, 209
Durgarāja, *Rāsh. ch.*, 125
Durjaya, *k.*, 90
Durjaya, *i.e., n. of a ch.* or 'unconquerable', 93

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Durlabhadēvī, *W. Cha q.*, 196
Durvinīta, *W. Gaṅga k.*, 105
Dushtyanta, *myth. k.*, 25
Dūta, off, 131, 155
Dvādaśaha, sac., 215, 218
Dvanda, compound, 22, 233
dvārapālas, 150
dvija, 'brāhmaṇa', 136
dvija, 'first three caste', 94, 99, 136
dvimagna-vaṁśasy=ōddhartṛi, tit., 58
dvīpa-laksha, i.e-, Jambūdvīpa *continent*, 240
dvivēda, tit., 145, 161, 163
dyvāmushyāyaṇa-kaulīna, meaning of, 25

E

East Coast, 123-24
Eastern Chalukyan records, 120
East Godavari Dt., 39, 46, 51 82, 84-86, 94, 103, 111, 150, 169, 176, 178, 198
eclipse:
lunar, 10, 15, 85
solar, 110
Sōma-rāhu-sagraha, 179
Sūrya-grahaṇa, 195
ēkādaśāsvamēdha etc. *ep.*, 6, 8
Ekādaśa-Pauṇḍarīka, i.e., Eleven *Pauṇḍarikas, sac.*, 213, 214
Ekādaśa-Pauṇḍarīka-prāptā-sawarddhi, ep., 216
Ekādaś-Āśvamēdha, eleven *Aśvamēdhas', sac.*, 213, 215-16
Ekāha, sac., 214, 222
ēka-vākyatā-bhaṅga 2
elephant warfare, 135
Ellore (Eluru) *l.*, 80
Elliot, 134
eras *:*
Āguptāyika, 53
Bhārata war (*i.e.*, Kali), 111
Christian, 49
Gaṅga, 67, 82, 89, 98, 99, 101, 102, 108
Gupta, 226, 227, 228
Kalachuri-Chēdi, 68, 209
Kali, 111
Śaka, 9, 11, 13, 15, 48, 70 81-83, 85, 95, 111, 114, 120 144, 211, 226, 233
Śakapati, 174
V.S., 71, 227
Eraṇ, *l.*, 228
Eran pillar ins., 228
Ermadāla, *vi.*, 39, 155
Erṛagudi, l., 32
ēṛu, 'lake' 119

F

Fleet, (J.F), 15, 67, 73, 77-78, 88, 93, 94, 99, 113-15, 118, 123, 168, 184, 224, 231
Fortnight, bright:
Śu., Śukla, 10, 16, 46, 65, 104, 120, 160, 167, 193
7th of a season (*i e.*, bright) 62, 160, 164
Fortnight, dark:
ba., Krishṇapaksha, 81, 83, 110, 173, 195, 196
2nd of the season (*i.e.*, dark), 81, 177
4th of the season (*i.e.*, dark) 94, 183
8th of the season (*i.e.*, dark) 80, 83, 112, 170, 171, 199

G

Gadag, *tn.*, 232
Gadwal tk,, 42
gaja, royal insignia, 243
Galavalli, -villi, vi., 104
gaṇadatti, gift, 181
Gaṇasvāmin, au., 91, 93, 144
Gaṇēśa, *g.*, 57
Gaṅga, *dy.*, 188
Gaṅga E., *dy.*, 47, 51, 56, 61, 67, 69, 73, 77, 82, 89, 97-105, 127, 136, 221
Gaṅga E., records of, 101
Gaṅga, W , *dy.*, 30, 100-01, 105, 128
Gaṅgādhara, *g.*, 150
Gaṅga era, 89, 98, 102, 108
Gaṅga principality, 101
Gaṅgavāḍi, *co.*, 100-01
Ganges, Gaṅgā, ri., 73, 202
Ganjam Dt., 26, 232
Ganjam pls. of Śaśāṅka, 228
Ganguli, 27
Gargatrirātra, *sac.*, 214
Garuḍa, *Vishṇu's vāhana*, 117 126, 142, 180
Garuḍa-lāñchhana, *crest*, 126
Garuḍapurāṇa, wk., 213
Gauḍa, *dy. of Bengal* 73
Gaurī, *g.*, 150
Gautama, *au.*, 145
Gautama, *gōtra*, 85, 112, 179, 195, 199
Gautamī Gödāvarī, *ri.*, 234
Gautamiputra Śrī Sātakarni, Sāta. *k.*, 32, 33, 127, 136, 206, 232-34
Gavīmaṭh, *l.*, 32
Gaya, Dt., 73, 227
Gaya, *tn.*, 73
Genitive case, 117, 203-04
ghalige, vi. assembly, 238
Ghantasala ins., 157
Ghaṭikā (-kāsthāna), *edn. inst.* 34, 42, 74. 75, 112, 142, 144-45, 169, 177, 236-38
ghaṭikā, 'pot', 237-38
ghaṭikā, unit time, 237
ghaṭikā-mārga, device of conducting exam, 146, 237-38
Ghosh, A., 228
Ghosal, R.K., 189
ghōṭaka-vigraha 'battle of horses', 68
Ghṛitakuṇḍaka, *p.n.*, 22
Gi , i.e., Gimha, Grīshma, 'summer season', 160, 199
Gi pa, i.e., Gimha-pakha (=Grīshma-paksha), 160
Girēśvarā, *i.e.* Pārvatī, *g.*, 171
giri, n. ending, 22
Giripaschimadesa, *co.*, 28
Gca ins. of the 5th Century A.D., 141
Goa pls. of Dhruvarāja Indra. varman, 75, 113, 120
gō-balīvarda-nyāya, 209
Gōdāvarī, *ri.*, 50, 54, 82, 85, 89, 103, 105, 179, 236
Godavari delta, 144
Godavari Dt. (old),, 232
Godavari Districts, 86, 182, 185

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Godavari pls. 81, 106
Godavari pls. set I, 39, 67-69, 76-77, 94-97, 99-101, 106, 108
Godavari pls. set II, 38-39, 95, 97, 106, 147
Gokak pls. of Dejjamahārāja, 53
gōlaṇgūla, emblem on banner, 117, 200
Gollavalli, *vi.*, 104, 192
Gollavalli grt., 90, 104, 108, 128
Gōparāja, *k.*, 228
Gōpasvamin, *donee*, 195, 196
Gōrantla pls. of Attivarman, 118, 127
gōtra, meaning of, 19
gōtras :
Āgnivēśya, 195
Ānanda, 103
Bhāradvāja, 30, 33, 46, 117-18, 161, 195
Bhṛigu, 104, 192
Bṛihatphalāyana, 103
Gautama, 85, 112, 179, 195 199
Kamakāyana, 103, 190
Kāśyapa, 136, 195
Kauṇḍinya, 81, 177
Kauśika, 195
Mānavya, 23, 194, 198
Māṇḍira, 65, 166
Māṭhara, 103
Ramakasyapa, 51, 68, 84, 103, 105, 190, 192
Śālaṅkāyana, 46, 103, 161
Tāmrakāśyapa, 105
Vāsishṭha, 103, 195
Vatsa, 46, 159
Vishṇuvṛiddha, 19
Gōvinda, *i.e.* Kṛishṇa-Vishṇu 40, 142, 173
Gōvinda, *n.*, 114, 142
Gōvinda, *Rāsh. ch.*, 114, 125-26
Gōvinda, *Vish. pr.*, 13, 113-14
Gōvindarāja *i.e.*, Gōvindavarman I, *Vish. k.*, 9, 44, 81, 95-96, 173, 175
Gōvindavarman I, *Vish. k.*, 2 3, 5, 9-10, 13-14, 36-40, 44-47, 51, 53, 55, 61, 81, 85, 87, 96, 137, 141-42, 144, 146, 154, 157, 159, 172
Gōvindavarman II Vikramāśraya, *Vish. ch.* 2-8, 11, 13-14, 47, 60, 78, 114, 178
Grahavarman, *Mau. k.*, 73
gramādhyaksha, off., 139
grāmavṛiddha, off., 132, 137, 186
grāmēyaka, 'individual villager', 137
grāmika, 'village headman', 137
griddhra i.e., vulture, *emblem on the banner*, 201
gridhr·ādhyāsita-kētana, banner, 117, 126
gṛihapati, 139
gṛihīta-sāhasra, tit., 145, 161, 195
Gṛihyasūtra, tit,, 49
Guddadi, *di.*, 46
Guddavadi, *di.*, 46, 85-86, 112 179, 198, 199
Guḍivāda, *vi.*, *di* , 46
Guḍivāda, *vi.*, 46
Gudivada pls. (set I) of Jayasiṁha, 111
Gūḍūru, *l.*, 62
Guhila, *dy.*, 30
Gujarat, *co.*, 91
Gulbarga Dt., 28
Guṇabhājana, tit., 76
Gunabhara, biruda, 76
Guṇabhartṛi, *Vish. pr.*, 13, 49, 56, 61-62, 64-65, 69, 76, 164
Guṇāḍhya, *au.*, 212
Guṇaga Vijayāditya, *E. Chā. k.*, 241
Guṇamudita, *Telugu Chōḍa pr.*, 76
Guṇapāśapura, *camping place*, 95, 142, 143, 185-87
Guṇapāśadura-giri, *hill*, 186
Guṇārṇava, *E. Gaṅga k.*, 189
Guṇavanta, *exp. as n.*, 62
Guṇḍlakamma, *r.*, 20
Guṇṭupalle, *Buddhist site*, 142
Guṇṭūr, *tn.*, 57
Guntur Dt., 20, 31, 45, 49-50, 54, 86, 92, 111, 119-20, 127, 130, 134, 147, 150, 159, 164 200, 231-32
Guṇṭur reg., 49, 55, 85, 90, 111, 124, 149
Gūntur tk., 92
Guntur-Nellore reg., 120
Gupta, *k.*, 21
Gupra, *dy.*, 18, 21, 37, 59, 71, 92, 219, 228
Gupta, Later, *dy.*, 72, 79
Gupta era, 226-28
Gupta of Magadha. *dy.*, 44
Gūrjara, *co.*, 114
guru, 'father', 110-11, 125, 195
guru-kula, 237,
Guṭṭavilli, *vi.*, 104

H

Hadagalli tk., 232
Hanumakoṇḍa, *l.*, 48
Hara, *i.e.*, Śiva, *g.*, 117, 177, 202
Hara, n., 22
Haraḥā, *l.*, 73
Haraha ins of V.S. 611, 71, 72-74, 78, 227-28
Haravṛishabha, 'Śiva's bull' 93
Harihara, p.n., 22
Harishēṇa, *Vā. k.*, 40, 42-44, 52, 55, 58, 61, 63, 64, 66, 70 71, 76, 78, 211
Hāritīputra, matr., 23
Hāritīputrā, ep., 194, 198
Harivarman, *Pṛi. ch.*, 95, 96, 98, 143, 186, 187
Harivatsakōtta, *hill fort*, 88
Harshacharita, wk., 72
Harshagupta, *Later Gupta k.*, 79
Harshagupta, *Pā. k.*, 227, 228
Harshavardhana, p.n., 22
Harshavardhana, *Pushyabhūti k.*, 44, 72-74, 79, 114, 241
Hastikōśa, off., 85, 86, 94, 112, 132, 179, 183, 199
Hastivarman Rājasiṁha Raṇabhīta, *E. Gaṅga k.*, 69, 89, 102, 108
Hastivarman, *Sālaṅkāyana k.* 19
Hathigumpha ins., of Khāravēla, 33, 196
Hayamēdhayājin, ep., 160
Himālaya -giri, -vat, -chala, *mt.*, 89, 201, 227, 239-40
Hīnayāna, *doctrine*, 143

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Hindu architects, 149
Hindu *te.*, 149
Hindu Trinity, 142, 232
Hinduism, *rel.*, 61, 141
Hirahadagalli pls., 22
Hirananda Sastri, 78, 205, 208
Hiraṇyagarbha, —garbha-mahādāna, rite, 46, 85, 159, 220
Hiraṇyagarbha-prasūta, tit., 4-6, 12, 57, 178
Hisse-Borala ins., 48
Huchimalliguḍi, *te.*, 148
Hultzsch, I, 3, 6, 12, 45-46, 62, 66, 77, 88, 92, 120-21, 128, 160, 165, 168-69, 224, 229, 231, 236
Hūṇa, *tribe*, 59
Hyderabad, *ci.*, 33, 192
Hyderabad area, 23, 208
Hyderabad pls. of Pulakēśi II 85, 114
Hyderabad State (old) 31, 34, 205

I

ih-āmutra-phala-bhōga-virāga, 243
Ikshvāku, *dy.*, 18, 22-24, 34, 49, 79, 130, 205-10
Ikshvāku, *k.*, 23
Ikshvāku, tribal n., 22, 23
Ikshavāku ins., 143
India, ancient, 211, 216
India, mainland of, 240
India, main rel. of, 141
India C., *di.*, 73, 118, 126, 143
India, N, *di.*, 18, 71
India, S., *di.*, 71, 130, 141, 148
India, W., *di.*, 73
Indian Ocean, 239
Indian thought, 135
Indian tradition, ancient, 240
Indian writers, 136
India, *g.*, 20, 29, 57, 149, 161, 221
Indra (*i.e.*, Indravarman I), *E. Gaṅga k.*, 92
Indra of y. 128-54, *Gaṅga k.*, 99
Indrabhaṭṭāraka *E. Chā. k.*, 67, 99
Indrabhaṭṭāraka (*-bhaṭṭaraka* varman), *Vish., k.*, 2-10, 12-14, 16, 18, 37-38, 53, 57, 63-65, 67-82, 87-92, 94-109, 131, 134-35, 142, 144, 147, 170, 173, 177, 183, 228, 231, 236
Indrabhaṭṭārikā *E. Mau. q.*, 74
Indraādhirāja, *s.a.* Indravarman I, *E. Gaṅga ch.*, 67-68, 76, 94, 97-101, 183
Indra-kuṇḍa, 20
Indrapālaguṭṭa, *l.*, 36, 39, 81
Indrapura, *ca.*, 36, 38-39, 95-96, 130, 142-43, 173
Indraśarman *donee.*, 61, 164
Indravarman I, *Vish. k.*, 10, 13-14, 23, 36, 38, 153
Indravarman (II), *s.a.*, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, *Vish. k.* 2, 4, 65, 113, 166-67
Indravarman, *n.*, 55
Indravarman I, *E. Gaṅga k.*, 67, 69, 73, 77, 89, 97, 99-102, 108, 136, 188
Indravarman II, Rājasiṁha, *E. Gaṅga, k* , 102, 108
Indravarman III, *E. Gaṅga, k* 102, 108
Indravarman IV, *E Gaṅga k.*, 47
Indravarman, son of Dānārṇava, *E. Gaṅga k.*, 102, 189
Indravarman of Achyutapuram pls., of year 87, *E. Gaṅga k.*, 99
Indravarman of the Chicacole pls. of y. 128, *E. Gaṅga k.*, 99
Indu, *i.e.*, the Moon 180
Indukānthi, 'n. of. ci.', 88, 93
Instrumental case, 128, 156, 171
inter-caste adoption, 136
inter-caste marriage, 211
Ipūr, *vi.*, 159, 164
Ipur pls. set I, 2-4, 11-12, 18, 23, 37-40, 45, 47, 51, 56, 61-62. 86, 134, 224-26, 229, 241
Ipur pls. set II, 3-6, 12-13, 18, 27, 37-38, 47-49, 56, 61-65, 70, 77, 231
Irudōṛa, *vi.*, 81, 173
Iśānavarman, *Mau. k.*, 19, 71-74, 78-79, 109, 228
Īśāvāsyōpanishad, 151
Īśvara, category 152
Iśvarakṛishṇa, *au.*, 152
Iśvaravarman, *Mau. k.*, 78

J

Jacobi, 243
Jaggay apeṭa, *Bud. site*, 142, 146, 206
Jaggayyapeta *ins.* 205
Jaimini, *au.*, 25, 146
Jaiminīya-Nyāyamāla-vistara wk., 209
Jain te., 141
Jaina, Jainism, *rel.*, 40, 119, 141, 143-44
Jaipur, *l.*, 90, 104, 106
Jajpur reg., 103
Jalalpuram pls. of Siṁhavarman, 82
Jambūdvīpa, *continent* 240-41
Janamējaya, *epic k.*, 217
janapada, 'country' 21, 31
janapada, t.d., 117, 119, 126, 132
Janapadamahattara, off., 132
Janāśraya, tit., 2-4, 6-11, 13-14, 16, 47, 60, 72, 78, 85, 88-89, 91, 93, 130, 138, 144, 179
Janāśrayadatti, gift, 85, 138, 179
Jānāśrayī, Jānāśrayī—Chhandōvichiti, wk., 14, 88, 91, 93, 146
Jānaśruti, *Upanishadic k.*, 26
Jannasvāmin, *donee*, 195
Jarāsandha, *epic villain*, 220, 222
jāti, tree, 233
Jaunpur Dt., 71
Jaunpur fragmentary ins., 71, 78, 79
Jayamaṅgala, wk., 41
jayantī 'birth', 39
Jayarāja, *Śara. k.*, 228
Jayasimha I, *E. Chā. k.*, 5, 6, 16, 67, 74, 86, 97, 111-12, 138, 145, 198
Jayasiṁha, *commander*, 88
Jayasiṁha, Jayasiṁha Vallabha, *W. Chā. k.*, 58, 88
Jayaswal, K.P., 28, 208

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Jayavarman, *Bṛihatphalāyana, k.*, 62
Jeypor reg., 71
Jijjikā, *s.a.* Jirjiṇgi, *vi.*, 100
Jirjiṅgi, *vi.*, 100, 188
Jirjingi pls., 67, 68, 99-102, 108
jñēya 'truth', 143
Jubbalpur, *tn.* 18, 224
Julius Eggeling, 213
Junagadh ins. of Rudradāman 32
Jupitor, *planet*, 163
Jyēshtha, Jyaishṭha, *month*, 65, 104, 110, 167, 192
Jyēshṭha-Koṇḍa, *donee*, 195
Jyōtir-Agnishṭōma, sac., 214

K

ka, suffix., 171
kaḍa, n. ending, 22
kaḍa, p.n., 22
Kadali, *vi.*, 94
Kadamba, *dy.*, 16, 18, 23, 27, 29, 31, 35, 43, 53-54, 74, 99 113, 125, 146, 168, 216, 220, 236, 237
Kadamba, *feu. f. of Kaliṅga*, 105
Kadambā, Kadambā-mahādēvī, *W. Chā. q.*, 110-11, 125, 135-37, 139, 195
Kadamba Charter, 175
Kadambagiri, *s.a.* Kaḷambā, *vi.*, 71
Kādambarī, wk., 85, 180
Kadambatīrtha, *holy place*, 162, 220
Kaikalur tk., 57, 103
Kaiśavam 'of Kēśava', 88, 179
Kākatīya, *dy.*, 48
Kākatīya kingdom, 57
kakkōla, tree, 233
Kākusthānvaya, *s.a.* Kadamba f., 168
Kalachuri, *dy.*, 27, 224
Kaḷamba, *vi.* 71
Kālapriyā, *i.e.*, Ambikā, Kālī, *g.*, 141
Kālapriyānātha, *i.e.*, Śiva, 141
kalaśa, figure on the coin, 134
Kali, *age*, 111
Kālī, *g.*, 141
Kālidāsa, *poet*, 32, 37, 211, 216, 221, 244
Kaliṅga, *myth. k.*, 25
Kaliṅga, *co.*, 33, 51, 68-70, 73, 77, 82, 89, 90, 98-103, 105, 106, 113-14, 143, 231
Kaliṅganagara, *ca.*, 127
Kallēśvara, *g.*, 21
Kalpataru-Parimaḷa, wk., 151, 163, 223
Kalūra, Kalūrapuru, *camping place*, 110-11, 125, 195, 197
Kalyāṇī, *ca.*, 41
Kāmadēva, *Kadamba k.*, 211, 212
Kāmakāyana, *gōtra*, 103, 191
Kambōja, *co.*, 28, 127
Kambōja, *ruling cl.*, 21
kāmya-karma, 142, 172
Kaṇāda, *au.*, 145, 151
Kanas pls. of Lōkavigraha, 227
Kanauj, *ca.*, 73
Kāñchī, Kañchīpuram, *ca.*, 35, 57, 74, 84, 85, 117, 122-23, 146, 160, 204, 237, 240
Kanchipuram ins. of the reign of Rājarāja III, 57
Kandaḷī, *i.e.*, Kadalī, *camping place*, 94, 182
Kandara, variant of *Kṛishna*, 127
Kandara (I), *Ānanda k.*, 49, 118
Kandara (II), Kandararāja, k., 58, 63, 65, 116-18, 121-22, 126-27, 200, 203, 232-34
Kandarapura, *ca.*, 117, 119, 200
Kandarapura reg., 63
Kandarapura-vara-janapada, *co* , 64, 65
Kandulapālem, *vi.*, 176
Kandulapalem pls., 1, 7, 11-13, 15, 60, 81, 84, 87, 104, 135, 219-21
Kane, P.V., 213
Kanhabeṁṇā, *s.a.* Kṛishṇā, *ri.*, 42
Kanishka I, *Kushāṇa k.*, 47
Kanishka II. *Kushāṇa k.*, 47
Kannaḍa, *la.*, 196
Kantēru, *vi.*, 119
Kanteru pls. of the Sālaṅkāyan ks., 57
Kanukollu pls. of Skandavarman, 168
Kāṇvāyana, *dy.*, 24, 26, 30, 209
Kapōta, *n. of Śiva*, 127
kapōta, 'pigeon', 142
Kapōta, *ascetic*, 117, 136, 142, 149, 152, 202, 204
kapōtavṛitti, 'life of dove', 136
kapōta-vṛitti s.a. uñchha-vṛitti, ascetic, 117, 127, 202
Kapōtēśvara, (Śiva), *g.*, 116-17, 141, 148-50, 202, 204
Kapōteśvara, legends of, 141-42
Kapōteśvara te., 116, 127, 136-37, 148-49, 200
Kara, tax or tribute, 133, 139, 219
kara-dāna-prabhṛiti-sarva-bādhā-varjam, priv., 163
Karhad tk., 46
Karimanagar Dt., 48, 134
Karmadhāraya, compound, 41, 233
Karma-kāṇḍa, vedic di., 144
Karmarāshṭra, *i.e.* Guṇṭūr-Nellore reg., 85-86, 120, 179
Karmpara, *vi.*, 183
Karṇa, *epic hero*, 211
Karṇa, *Kalachuri k.*, 68
Karnāṭaka, *co.*, 52, 148, 148, 231-32
Karnāṭaka, *st.*, 28, 101, 105, 232
Kārttika, *month*, 103, 173
karuṇā, 'compasion', 143
Kasakkudi pls. of Nandivarman Pallavamalla, 118, 120, 236
Kashmirian, 206, 211,
Kāśikā, wk., 28
Kāśyapa, *gōtra*, 136, 195
Kaṭachchuri, *dy.*, 113
Kathāsaritsāgara, wk., 206
Kaṭṭucheṟuvulu, *vi.*, 95, 186
Kauṇḍinya, *gōtra*, 81, 177
Kauśika, *gōtra*, 195
Kaustubha, *myth, gem.* 173, 175
Kauṭilya, *au.*, 112, 127, 131, 135, 221, 239
Kāvyamīmāṁsā, wk., 233, 239-40, 243
Kāyastha, scribe, 131, 162-63

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Keith, 213
Keonjar St., 73
Kērala, *ruling cl.*, 21
Kern, 41
Kēsānapalle, *Buddhist site*, 142
Kēśava, *i.e.* Buddha, 180
Kēśava, *i.e.* Vishṇu, *g.*, 180
Kēśavasvāmin, *donee*, 46, 161
Khanapur pls., 13, 15, 46-48, 52-53, 131, 213, 220, 231
Khanapur tk., 161
Khānāpur, *t.n.*, 13, 161
Khaṇḍadēva, *au.*, 222
Khandakoṇḍi, *s.a.*, *Skandakoṇḍi*, *p.n.*, 28
Khandesh, *di.*, 41
Khandesh *reg.*, 31-32
Khāravēla, *Chēdi k.*, 33, 196
Kielhorn, 1, 15, 18-20, 58, 67, 81, 88, 128, 171, 184, 220, 224, 236, 238
Kirātārjunīya, *wk.*, 91, 93
Kīrttirāja, Kirttivarman I, *W. Chā. k.*, 16, 48, 72-73, 78, 110, 113, 122, 158, 196, 198
Koḍabalisiri, *Ikshvāku pr.*, 34
Kodavali ins., 208
Kolēru, *lake*, 86, 89-90, 103-04, 106, 111-12, 115-16, 118-19, 122-23, 147
Kōlika, *vi.*, 161
Kolikāvāṭikā, *garden*, 162
Kōlissaras, *i.e.*, Koleru lake, 116, 119, 122, 200, 203
Kollūru, *vi.*, 111
Koṇḍamāna, *p.n.*, 33
Koṇḍamañchi, Koṇḍamañchili, *vi.*, 103, 191
Kondamudi pls. of Jayavarman, 62, 77
Koṇḍāpūr, *l.*, 42
Koṇḍapūr coins, 33-34, 42
Koṇḍapaḍumaṭidēśa, *s.a.* Giripaśchimadēśa, *co.*, 21, 38
Koṇḍapadumatis, 'chiefs of Koṇḍapadumāṭi-dēśa', 20, 21
Kōṇḍeḍḍa grt., 225
Koṇḍūru, *vi.*, 85
Koṅkaṇ, *co.*, 114
Koṇralaganru, *vi.*, 186
Koppām, *vi.*, 120
Kopparam pls. of Pulakēśi II 7, 118, 120-21, 123, 128
Koraput Dt., 82
kōśa, '(department of) treasury', 132
Kōsala, *i.e.* Dakshiṇa or S. Kōsala, *co.*, 43, 52, 72, 114, 224, 226, 228, 231
Kōṭappakoṇḍa, *hill*, 231-33
Kotappakonda ins. 231-32
Kovur tk., 234
krama, *i.e. parāgrama*, 'valour', 140, 189
kratu, 'sac.', 214
Kratusahasra, *s.a.*, *Agnishtōmasahasra*, *sac.* 213
Kratusahasrayājin, *ep.*, 116, 169, 214
Kratusahasra, *sac.*, 2, 65, 85, 166, 169, 172, 176, 178
Krauñcha, *mt.*, 88, 89, 93
Kṛishṇa, Kṛishṇa-Vishṇu, *incarnation*, 40, 150, 216, 219, 222
Kṛishṇa, *n.*. 127
Kṛishṇā, Kṛishna-Bēṇṇā, Krishṇa-Veṇṇā, *ri.*, 18, 28, 31, 33, 35, 46, 49, 50, 55, 62, 76, 80-83, 90, 92, 111, 116-17, 119, 123, 137, 161, 170, 205, 220
Kṛishṇā delta, 143
Krishna Dt., 46, 57, 81, 83, 103, 147
Kṛishṇā-Gōdāvarī doab, 83, 115-16
Krishṇapaksha, 'dark fortnight', 173
Krishna Rao, B.V. 231
Krishna Sastri, H., 2, 15, 18, 66, 86, 134, 151, 224, 231
kṛit-ābhisandhi-sahāya adj., 202
kṛita-kṛitya, 32
kṛit-tilakabhūta, *ep.*, 194
Kshatra *i.e.*, Kshatriya, *cte.*, 29, 30, 45
Kshatrapa, W., *dy.*, 18
Kshatra-vritti, 'profession of Kshatriya', 136
Kshatriya, *cte*, 24-26, 30, 56, 99, 136, 164, 211-12, 216, 222
Kshatriya *cte*, factors deciding, 136
Kshatriyahood, 24, 26
kshatriya-śrēṇi, 'corporation of warriors', 127
Kshatriy-āvaskanda-pravarttitāpratima-vikshyāta-parākrama ep., 24, 164
kshētra, 'wife', 25
Kubja, *poet*, 27
kuḍ, *Skt. root*, 28
Kuḍāvāḍa, *s.a.* Guḍivāḍa, *vi.*, 46
Kuḍāvāḍa-vāsaka, *camping place*, 159
kuḍavōlai, *sys. election*, 238
Kuddavādi (*i.e.* Guddavādi) *vishaya*, *di.*, 179
Kudrāhāra, Kudūrāhāra, *di.*, 76
Kudrāvaḷi *vishaya*, *di.*, 104, 192
kūḍu, 150
Kudūra, Kudūrapura, *s.a.* Kūḍūru, *camping place*, 61-62, 65, 77, 164
Kudūranagara s.a. Kuḍūrapura, *tn* , 62
Kūḍūru, Gūḍūru, *l.*, 61
Kukurwa, *co.*, 127
Kulōttuṅga Chōḷa I, *Chola k.*, 92
Kumāragupta, *Gupta k.*, 37
Kumāravishṇu, *Pal. k.*, 50
Kumārilabhaṭṭa, *au.*, 237
Kumārīpura, (Cape Comorin) 240
Kumbhasambhava (Agastya), *sage*, 233
Kumuda, *elephant*, 68, 97, 99, 108, 183
kumuda, 'water lily', 88-89, 93
Kunāla, *i.e.*, Kolēru, *lake*, 111
kuṇḍa, 'altar', 19
kuṇḍa, 'vessel', 20
Kuṇḍa, Kuṇḍi, *n.*, 21-22
kuṇḍa, *n. ending*, 22
kuṇḍa, *s.a. kaḍa*, 22
kuṇḍa, *kuṇḍi*, 28
Kunrūru, *s.a.*, Koṇḍūru, *vi.*, 85-86, 176
Kuntala, *co.*, 23, 29, 31, 41-42, 54, 61

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Kuntala, 'empire of the kings of Kalyāṇi', 41
Kuram pls. of Paramēśvara-varman I, 76
Kurnool Dt., 19, 32, 205
Kurnool-Bellary-Raichur *reg.* 31
Kuru, *co.*, 127
Kurukshētra war, 49
kuśala-mūla, *Bud.*, *t.t.*, three kinds of, 155
Kushāṇa, *dy* , 47, 141
Kushāṇa ins. 163
kūṭa, 'peak', 232
kūṭa-yuddha, 'treacherous battle', 135
ku-tilakabhūta, *ep.*, 196
kuṭumbin, 'head of family', 137
Kuvalayāpīḍa, *elephant*, 150

L

Laccadive Islands, 240
Laghuśabdēnduśēkhara, *wk.*, 28
Lakshadvīpa, Laccadive Islands, 240
lakshaṇas, 'characteristics' varieties of, 143
Lakshman Rao, K.V. 3, 120, 165, 180, 224, 239
Lakshmī, *g.*. 150, 175
Lakshmī, *sym. on seal*, 23
Lakshmī-Nārāyaṇa, *g.*, 142
Lalitā, *g.*, 205
Lalitāṅkura-Pallavēśvara, *n.*, 151
Lalitāsahasranāma, *hymn.*, 171
Lalitōpākshyāna, *wk.*, 205
lamp, *figure on the seal*, 159
Laṅkā, or Ceylon, 233
Lāṭa, *co.*, 114
law-suits, three or four factors to decide, 135, 136
lēkhya, 237-38
Lēnḍuḷūra, *camp*, 80-81, 169
liṅga worship, 148-49
lion, maned, *figure on the coin*, 134
lions, figures of above the ins , 157
lion, figure of, on the seal, 23, 153, 166, 169
lion-crest, 35, 53
lion & vase, *Vish*, *emblems*, 147
Lohner pls. of Pulakēśi II, 15
Lōkanātha, *a Buddha*, 175
Lōkapāla, *g.*, 221
Lōkavigraha, *k.*, 227
long-apsidal-ended temple, 148
Longhurst, 40, 148
Lüders, 29

M

m. final, 58
Macdonell, 213
Macha, *mt.*, 233
Machhavaryyā, *l.*, 161
Madanāntaka, *g.*, 150
Madayantī, *myth. chara.*, 196
Mādhava, *n.*, 142
Mādhava, *Sāyaṇa's brother*, 93
Mādhavarāja *s.a.* Mādhava-varman II, *Vish. k.*, 9, 45, 81, 84, 95-96, 137, 173, 175
Mādhavavarman, great-grand father of Vikramēndra II, *Vish. k.*, 4
Mādhavavarman I, *Vish. k.*, 10, 13-14, 36-38, 153
Mādhavavarman I (*i.e.*, II) of the Ipur pls. (II), *Vish. k.*, 2-6, 8-9, 13
Mādhavavarman I (*i.e.*, IV) *Janāśraya Vish. k.*, 7
Mādhavavarman II, *Vish. k.*, 2,6, 9, 10, 12-14, 16, 20, 31, 37, 39-40, 44-63, 65-68, 80, 82-83, 86, 96, 101, 105, 121, 130, 134, 139, 141, 147-48, 157, 159, 161, 163-64, 166, 169, 172, 176, 179, 213-29, 231, 240
Mādhavavarman II (*i.e.*, III) *Vish. k.*, 2-8, 12, 13
Mādhavavarman III, *Vish. k.*, 13, 16, 37, 48, 50, 52, 57, 61-66, 69-70, 76, 77, 130, 164, 231-34
Mādhavavarman III (*i,e.*, II), *Visk. k.*, 3
Mādhavavarman III (*i.e.*, IV) *Janāśraya*, *Vish. k.*, 6, 8
Mādhavavarman IV, (*Janāś-raya*) *Vish. k.*, 2-6, 8-14, 16, 46-48, 60, 72, 78, 83, 85-91, 98, 103-06, 109, 113-15, 138, 144, 147, 160, 179, 180, 228-29, 239-44
Mādhavavarman Śrīnivāsa, *Sail. k.*, 27
Mādhāvī, *g.*, 205
Mādhyamika, *Bud. ph.*, 17
Madhya Pradesh, *st.*, 149
Madra, *f.*, 30
Madraka, *co.*, 113
Madugula, *l.*, 150
Magadha, *co.*, 44, 73, 113, 227-28
Magadha, W, *di.*, 228
Māgala, *vi.*, 232
Māgallu, Māṅgallu, Maṅgo-llu, *vi.*, 83
Maghavat, (Indra), *g.*, 88
Mahābalipuram, *vi.*, 116, 149
Mahābhārata, *epic*, 19, 20, 136, 149, 211, 214-20
Mahābhāshya, *wk.*, 238
Mahābhishēka, *vedic rite*, 220
Mahaduktha, *vedic*, *hymns*, 145
Mahāgāmi, *Mahagrāmika*, *off.* 28
mahākavi, *tit.*, 60, 176
Mahākshatrapa, *tit.*, 32
Mahākūṭa pillar ins., 73, 125, 196
Mahāmātra, *off.*, 179
Mahāmūla, *n.*, 108
Mahānāman, *k.*, 227
Mahānavamī, 129
mahāpātaka, *sin*, five of, 155
mahāpurusha-lakshaṇa, *t.t.*, thirty-two of, 154-55
Mahārāja, *tit.*, 36, 38, 41, 56, 60-61, 65, 68, 81, 85, 89, 94, 97, 100-06, 116-18, 121, 128, 130, 153-54, 159, 161, 165, 169-70, 172, 176-77, 179, 182 185, 188-90, 192, 198, 202, 222
Mahārājadhirāja, *imperial tit.* 71
Mahārāshṭra, *co.*, 21, 52, 231
Maharashtra, *st.*, 92, 134, 147, 161, 227

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Mahārāshṭra, S, *di.*, 53
Mahārāshṭraka, three, *co.*, 114
Mahāraṭhi, desi. 33, 42
Mahāraṭhi coins, 24, 33
Mahāraṭhi, *f.*, 23
Mahāsāmantavarman *s.a.* Samantavarman, *E. Gaṅga k.*, 82, 102, 108
Mahāsēna Gupta, *Later Gupta k.*, 72, 79
Mahasēnāpati, off., 33, 207
Mahāsēnāpatisa Bharadajiputasa Sagamāna-Chuṭukulasa', coin legend, 33
Mahāśivagupta Bālārjuna, *Paṇ. k.*, 227
Mahāśivagupta Tīvaradēva, *S. Kōsala k.*, 56
mahattara, off, 132
mahāvihāra, 186
mahāvrata, rite, 214
Mahāvrata hymns, *vedic*, 145
Mahāvyutpatti, wk., 156
Mahāyāna, *sect.* 142, 143, 156
Mahbubnagar Dt., 9, 26, 31, 32, 42
Mahēndra, *mt*, 206
Mahēndragiri, *l.*, 26
Mahendragiri., *Pithapuram ch.*, 19
[Mahēndra?] pōtēśvara, *i.e.*, Mahēndravarman I *Pall. k.*, 117, 202, 204
Mahēndravāḍa, *vi.*, 86
Mahēndravarman I, *Pal. k.*, 40, 76, 84-85, 89-90, 106, 116, 118-19, 121-23, 129, 144, 147-48, 151, 152, 180, 202-04, 234, 243
Mahēndravikrama, *i.e.*, Mahēndravarman, Pal. k., 116-118
Mahēndra-Vishṇu-gṛiha, n. of te., 203
Mahida, *mt.*, 233
mahī-Mahēndra, tit, 177
mahitalala-nṛipati. Bhāskara, ep., 179
māhut, 135
Maitraka, *dy.*, 76
Majumdar, R.C., 42, 73
Makara, *sign of Zodiac*, 163
malai (Dravidian), 'hill', 232, 233
Malakhēṭake, *vi.*, 161
Mālava, *s.a.* Malwa, 32
Mālava, *co.*, 43, 72-73, 114, 203
Mālava, *s.a.* Daśārṇa, *co.*, 32
Malavalli ins., 21-23, 34, 42
Mālavī 'Mālava woman' 203
Mālavikāgnimitra, drama, 216-17
Malaya, *mt.*, 18, 27, 39, 63-65 206, 231-35
Malaya (*i.e.*, Travancore hills), 233
Malayas, *mt.* four of, 233-34
malaya (Skt.), *malai* (Dravidian), 'hill', 32-33
Malaya, proper noun, 233, 235
Malayādhipati, tit., 234
Malaya *territory of Vēṅgī*, 234
Malayāvani, *principality*, 63, 234
Mālini, *metre*, 187
Mallam, *l.*, 57
Mallam record of Nandivarman Pallavamalla, 57, 125
Mallikārjuna, *g.*, 19, 36, 141, 206, 208
Mallikārjuna *te.*, 148
Malwa reg , 32
Malwa E , *co.*, 32
Māmaṇḍūr Cave, 148
Mamatā, *myth. chara.*, 25, 211
Mānabhīta Dharmarāja, *Śail. k.*, 225-26, 228
Maṇalkuḍi, *vi*, 94, 99-101, 183
Mānamātra Durgarāja, *Sara. k.*, 228
Mānāṅka, *Rāsh. k.*, 53
Mānapura, *ca.*, 46-48, 53, 55, 58-59, 135, 161, 220, 231
Mānasada, *Aira k.*, 23
Mānava-dharma-Śāstra, wk., 196
Mānavasūtra, wk., 222
Mānavya, *gōtra*, 23, 194, 198
Mañchyaṇṇabhaṭṭāraka, *Vish pr.*, 3, 4, 6-8, 13, 46, 56, 69
Maṇḍagappaṭṭu Cave, 148
Maṇḍapa, 157
Māṇḍira, *gōtra*, 65, 166, 168
Maṅgaḷagiri, *l.*, 92, 111
Maṅgalapura, *ca.*, 110-11, 195
Maṅgalēśa, *W, Chāl. k.*, 110, 113, 196
Maṅgallu grt, of Amma II, 80
Māṅgallu grt, of Dānārṇava, 92
Māṅgallūr, *vi.*, 92
Mangalore, *ca.*, 111, 125
Māṅgaḷūru *s a.* Māṅgallu, *vi.* 82-83, 92
Māṅgaḷūru grt. of Siṁhavarman (II) 50, 82-83, 115, 123
Maṅgiyuva (or duva) rāja, *E. Chā. k.*, 118, 120
Maṇkuḍa, *l.*, 100, 101
Maṇṇai, Maṇṇē, *s.a.* Mānyapura, *ca.*, 100
Maṇṇaikkuḍi, Maṇalkuḍi, *s.a* Maṇkuḍa *ca.* 97, 99-100, 109
Manu, *au.*, 131, 155, 167, 186, 221
Manu, *myth. k.*, 198
Mānyapura, *ca.*, 100
Māra (*i.e.*, Cupid) 185
Mārasiṁha II, *W. Ganga k.*, 30
Mārkaṇḍēya-purāṇa, wk., 31
Mars, *planet*, 163
Maruts, *g.*, 25
Marutstōma, sac., 25
Maruṭūra (—ru), *vi.*, 110-11, 196
Māruṭūra gr., 10, 105-06, 110, 114-16, 119, 122-23, 125, 136
Maski, *l.*, 32
Masulipaṭṇam *reg.*, 63, 64, 69
Masulipaṭṇam, *tn.*, 62
Māṭhara, *f.*, 51, 68-69, 105
Māṭhara, *gōtra*, 103
Mātṛi-gaṇa, g., 198
Matṛiśarman, *Brāhmaṇa*, 192
Matsyapurāṇa, wk., 205
Mattavilāsaprahasana, wk., 118, 144
Mattepad pls. of Dāmōdaravarman, 119
Maukhari, *dy.*, 19, 71-74, 77-79, 109, 135, 227-28
Maukhari rd., 73
Maukhari-Pāṇḍuvaṁśī marriage, 72

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Maukhari-vishṇukuṇḍi, confrontation, 73
maula-bala 'hereditary force; 122
Maurya, *dy.*, 30, 32, 113, 209, 241
Mayidavolu pls. of Śivaskandavarman, 119
Māyidēva, *min.*, 211
Mayindavāṭaki, *i.e.*, Mahēndravāḍa, *vi.*, 85-86, 179
Mayūraśarman-varman, *Kadamba k.*, 23, 35, 53, 74, 146 216, 236-37
Mayūravara.dhvaja (*i.e.*, Skanda-Kārttikeya) *g.*, 88-89, 93
Mercury, *planet*, 180
Mēsha, *sign of Zodiac*, 163
Metres :
Anushtubh, 153, 155, 158, 180
Mālinī, 187
Śārdūlatikrīḍita, 175
Upajāti, 175
Upēndravajrā, 196
Mihirakula, Mihirgul, p.n., 28
Mīmāṁsā, *i.e.*, *tarka, ph.*, 151
Mīmāṁsā-sūtra, wk., 140
Minor Rock Edict I of Aśōka 241
Mirashi, V.V., 28, 41-42, 46, 163, 231
Mitākṣharā, com., 139
Mitavarman, *Gaṅga ch.*, 94, 99-101, 108-09, 182
Mogalarājapuram, *vi.*, 150
Mogalrājapuram cave te., 142 147-50, 152
Mōksha, 110
Months :
Vaiśākha, 39, 110, 154, 163, 189
Jyēshṭha, 65, 104, 110, 167, 192, 195
Āśvina, 128
Kārttika, 81, 83, 103, 120, 128, 173, 191
Months, 45
Pausha, 45
Taisha (Pausha), 45
Phālguna, 10, 16, 85
moon, symbol on the seal, 159
Mōragiri, place n., 22
M.P. *st.* 227
Mṛigēśavarman, *Kadamba k.*, 27, 168
Muḍānanda, *ep.*, 28
Mudrārākshasa, wk., 125, 209
Mukhalingam pillar ins. of Anantavarman Chōḍagaṅga, 127
Mūla, *n.*, 97, 108
Mūlaraja *i.e.*, Pṛithivīmūla II *ch*, 95, 185
Mūlavaṇija, *n.*, 108
Muṇḍa, *tr.* or *cl.*, 28
Muṇḍa coins, 29
Muṇḍānanda, tit., 21
Muni (*i.e.*, the Buddha) 185
Murōdyakaḷiki (—ḷuki) *vi.*, 61-62, 164-65
Murāri-griha *i.e.*, *Vishṇu te*, 203
Muraripu on Garuḍa, *i.e.*, Vishṇu, *g.*, 117, 142
Mūshaka, *co.*, 113
Musinikoṇḍa, *vi.*, 144
Mysore, *st.*, 100

N

Naḍumbi-vasati, *Jain te.*, 144
Nāḍupuḍi, *vi.*, 111
Nāga, *sym. on coin*, 23, 29, 159
Nagai ins., 236
Nāgarāja, *Naga k.*, 211
Nagaram island, 94
Nagarī, *l.*, 149
Nāgārjuna, *ph.*, 17
Nāgārjuna, *Tāntrika*, 17, 205-06
Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, *l.*, 22, 144, 205-07
Nagarjunakoṇḍa ins., 21, 130, 206, 208
Nāgārjuni Hill cave ins , 73
Nagāvalī, *ri.*, 66
Nāga, Nāgavaṁśa, *i.e.*, Kashmirian ro. f., 211-12
Nāgēśa, *au.*, 28
Nagnaśarman, *donc* , 65, 166
Naihik-āmutrika, biruda, 243
Nala, *dy.*, 43, 58, 71, 74, 77-78, 82, 113
Nalavāḍi, *co.*, 78
Nalgonda Dt., 31, 36, 52, 83, 134, 153, 172
Nalgoṇḍa reg., 31
Nallamalai, *hill*, 205-07
Nandigama *tk.*, 80-81, 83, 92
Nandi-maṇḍapa, 200
Nandivardhana, *ca.*, 71
Nandivarman I, *Pal. k.*, 43
Nandivarman, *Pal. k.*, 217, 236
Nandivarman Pallavamalla, *Pal, k.*, 30, 43, 57, 97, 100, 118, 125
Nanna, Nannarāja, *Rāsh. k.*, 114
Nanna, *Pān. k.*, 226, 228
Narasannapēṭa reg., 102
Narasāpuram tk., 103
Narasaraopet tk., 64, 120, 200, 231-32
Narasaraopet, *tn.*, 231
Narasiṁhavarman, *Pal. k.*, 236-37
Narasiṁhavarman I, *Pal. k.*, 129
Narasiṅgapalli pls. of Gaṅga y. 79, 102, 108
Narasipatnam tk., 81, 92
Nārāyaṇa, i.e., Vishṇu, *g.*, 108
Narēndra, *Śara. k.*, 228
Narēndrasēna, *Vā. k.*, 43, 51-52, 54, 58-59, 63
Narmadā, *ri.*, 51, 54, 234, 243
Nāsik, *l.*, 32, 148
Nasik Cave ins of Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi, 127, 206
Nasik ins. of Puḷumāvi, 24, 28, 31-32, 162
Natapati, Nātavādi, Nathavāḍi (—vāṭi), *di.*, 80, 83, 170
Naṭarāja, Naṭēsa, *g.*, 148, 152
Natarja, with eight hands, 148, 149
Natāvaṭa, *vi.*, 110-11, 196
navakarma-vyāpārādhikṛita, navakarmika, 'monk in charge of erection of Buddhist building' 95, 108, 186

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

nayam=Aušanasam 'political wisdom of Uśanas, *i.e.*, Śukra' 179, 180
Nellore-Guṇṭur reg., 82, 85
Nellur Dt., 57, 86, 125
Nerur pls. of Maṅgalēśa, 196
New Moon day 20
Nidadavolu tk., 234
nidhi, 'treasure' 133
nidhi, *ro. insignia*, 243
Nilakanta Sastri, K.A., Sastri K.A.N., 4, 128, 224
Nīlakaṇṭha, *au.*, 30, 212
nīrakētu, *adj.*, 118, 200
Nishāda, *tr.*, 217, 223
nivariana, *l.m.*, 85, 179
Nivinā grt., 225
niyama 'rel. austerity', 164
Nominative case., 117, 203
Nolamba Pal. *dy.*, 42
nṛipatigandhagaja, *tit.*, 158
Nyāya, Nyāyadarśana, *ph.*, 103, 145-46, 190
Nyāya, *padārthas* of, 151
Nyāyasūtra, *wk.*, 151

O

Ocean S., 89
Ojas 'long compound', 146
Oṅgōḍu grt. (Set I) of Siṁhavarman, 43-44, 182
Oṅgōḍu grt. (II) of Skandavarman II, 58
Orrisa, *st.*, 73, 104

P

pa. i.e., pakha, paksha, 'fortnight', 160
pachchaya, Skt., *pratyaya*, 'necessaries of monks, 108
padārthas, 'categories', 145
padesasājas, *pradēśarājas*, 'chiefs', 241
Padmaśarman, *donee* 104, 192
Pāguṇāra *vishaya*, *di.*, 103, 190
Pahlava, *fa.*, 30
Paiṅgala, *wk.*, 93
Paishṭapuraka, *adj.*, 12
Paishtapuraka, *dy. n.*, 20
pakka, *i.e.*, *paksha*, 'fortnight' 170
Pakki, *l.*, 66
Pālāru, *ri.*, 204
Pāli, *la.*, 41
Palkiguṇḍu, *l.*, 32
Palkonda tk., 66, 102, 104
Pallankovil pls. of Siṁhavishṇu, 93
Pallava, *dy.*, 3, 6, 21, 23, 26, 30-31, 34-35, 40, 43-45, 47, 49-50, 54, 63, 65-66, 76, 81-85, 89-90, 92, 98, 106-07, 115-16, 118-19, 121-25, 128, 134-36, 144, 146-48, 152, 157, 174, 204, 217, 219, 223, 234, 236, 238, 240, 243
Pallava, *k.*, 21
Pallava caves, sculptures in, 84
Pallava-Chālukya conflict, 115, 122
Pallava ins., 43, 58, 84, 138, 160
Pallava empire, 34, 119
Pallava Jinālaya, *Jaina te.*, 42
Pallava-Vishṇukuṇḍi matrimonial contact, 84
Palnād area, 206
Panamalai Śiva *te.*, 152
Pañchālas, *ruling cl.*, 21
Panchamukhi, R.S., 4, 109, 180
Paṇḍaraṅgapalli grt, 53, 57-58
Pāṇḍava, Pāṇḍuvaṁśi, *dy.*, 224-29
Pāṇḍava, *epic hero*, 49, 218-19
Pāṇḍita, *tit.*, 162
Pāṇḍuvaṁśi *s.a.* Sōmavaṁśi, *dy.*, 72
Pāṇḍya, *dy.*, 113, 127
Pāṇini, *au.*, 28, 41, 152, 207
Paṅkabaṇḍa, *vi.*, 39
Paṅkera, *vi.*, 39
paradātti meanings of, 138, 140
Paramabhāgavata, *tit.*, 37
Paramabhaṭṭārikā-mahādēvī, *Vish. q.*, 9, 81, 137, 146, 173, 175
Paramabhaṭṭārika-mahādēvī, *tit.*, 44
Paramabhaṭṭārikā-mahāvihāra, *Bud. mon.*, 9, 81, 143, 173
Parabrahmaṇya, *tit.*, 97, 103, 177, 179, 186, 190, 192, 198
parama-dhārmika, *tit.*, 39, 173
Paramamahādēvī, *Vish. q.*, 39 44, 95-96, 130, 154
Paramamahādēvī-vihāra, *Bud. man*, 36
Paramamāhēśvara, *tit.*, 40, 75, 84, 94, 97, 141, 166, 170, 177, 182, 186
Paramāra, *dy.*, 20
Paramasaugata, *tit.*, 40, 172
Paramēshthin, *pāramēshthitā*, *pāramēshṭhya*, *paramēshṭitva* meanings of, 169, 176, 220
Paramēśvara (*i.e.*, Śiva) *g.*, 100, 117, 126-27, 188, 201, 227
Paramēśvaravaravarman I, *Pal. k.*, 76
Parāṇṭaka Choḷa I, *k.*, 238
Parāśara, *au.*, 32, 41
paraśāstra, 'later rule', 209
Parasmaipada, *voice of verb*, epic form of, 163, 171
Paraśurāma, *epic hero*, 211
Paribhāshēnduśēkhara, *wk.*, 209
parinirvāṇa, 'death', 39
Pariyaparu, *vi.*, 186
Parlakimēdi pls. of Indravarman II, y. 97, 108
parvata, *common & proper noun*, 209, 233
Parvata, *s.a.* Śrīparvata, *hills* 19
Pārvatēya, 27
Pārvatī, *g.*, 117, 127, 141, 171, 205
Pārvatī-Paramēśvara, *g.*, 141, 150, 201
paryagni-karana, *sac. rite.*, 214
Pāśarlapūḍi, *vi.*, 95
pat, *Skt root*, 42
Pātamāna, *n.*, 33, 42
Patañjali, *au.*, 145
paṭihāriya prātihārya, *Bud t t*, 175
Paṭṭadakal, *l.*, 148
Pauṇḍarīka, *sac.*, 46, 48, 176, 215-16, 220, 222
Pauni pls. of Pravarasēna II, 58

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Paurāṇikas, 24, 206-07
Paurava, *fa.*, 26, 211
Paurushamēdhika, *d of sac.*, 214
Pausha, *month*, 45
Pavner, *l.*, 70-71, 134
Peddamaddali pls. of Jayasiṁha, 145
Peddapuram tk., 46, 51
Persian, *la.*, 28
Perumāli, *vi.*, 66
Peruvāṭaka (vāḍaka), *vi* , 65, 66, 166
phalaśruti, 'promise of reward 45, 158
Phalavidhi, *Vedic injunction*, 220
Phālguna, *month*, 16, 85
Phā!gunī-pūrṇimā, 86
Piṅgala, *au.*, 93
piṛadatti (Tamil) *s.a. Skt.-pradatti* gift, 140
Pishṭapura, *s.a.* Pīṭhāpuram, *ca.*, 24, 51, 54, 84, 89-90, 103-06. 110-11, 115-16, 122, 190, 195
Pishṭapura reg., 51, 55
Pīthapuram, *ca.*, 19
Piṭhapuram, *tn.*, 51, 103, 111
Pithapuram ins. of Pṛithvīśvara, 109
Piṭṛibhakta, *fa.*, 68, 105
Pḷakirāshṭra, *di.*, 65-66, 69, 166
Pḷaki (Paḷakki)-vishaya, *di.*, 66
Pōdāgaḍh, *l.*. 78
Podagadh ins. of Skandavarman, 43, 71, 77-78
Polakēśi s a., *Pulakēśi*, *n.*, 15, 28
Polamūru, *vi.*, 85-86, 178, 198
Polamuru Pls. Seṭ I, 1-4, 6, 8, 14, 16, 46-47, 60, 72, 85-88, 93, 105, 110, 112, 146, 180, 224-26, 228-29, 239-40, 242-44
Polamuru pls., set II, 6, 8-9, 12-14, 16, 46, 74, 86-87, 93, 113, 181
Ponnuturu pls. of Mahāsāmantavarman Gaṅga y. 64, 82, 102, 108
Possessive Case, 203
post-Vishṇukuṇḍi age, 144
Prabhākāra, *Prit.*, *ch.*, 94-97, 182, 185
Prabhāvatī, -ṭṭguptā, *Vā. q.*, 37, 55, 59-60
prādhirājya s.a. *adhirājya*, 'supremacy' 219
Prajāpati, *g.*, 220
Prājāpatya, *sac.*, 169
Prājāpatya, *Purāṇic rite*, 214
Prājāpatya, *Vedic sac.*, 213
Prākṛit, *la.*, 3, 6, 21, 28, 31, 35, 38, 47, 93, 165, 184
Prākṛit records, 119
prakṛiti, 'proto-type; 215
prakṛiti-maṇḍala 'council of ministers', 11, 74, 173
prayāṭhaka, *Vedic di.*, 152
Prasannamātra, *Sara. k.*, 228
praśastikāras, 243
Pratap-ōpanta-sakala-sāmanta etc., *tit.*, 60
pratigraha, one of the six-fold duties, 161
Pratihāra, *fa.*, 211
pratihārya, *Bud. t.t.*, meaning and kinds of, 172, 175
pratilōma marriage, 211
pratyādāna, 195, 197
Pratyēkabuddhayānā; *Bud. sect*, 143, 156,
pravara, 19
Pravarapura, *ca.*, 42, 70
Pravararāja, *Śara. k.*, 228
Pravarasēna I, *Vā. k.*, 23, 34-35, 54
Pravarasēna II, *Vā. k.*, 36-37, 39, 40, 43, 51, 55-56, 58, 60, 141
Pravarasēna II *Vā. k.*, *of Vatsagulma*, 53
pravāsa, 195, 197
prāyaśchitta, *rite*, 140, 213-14
Prēṅkapaṛa, *vi.*, 155
primogeniture, principle of, 130
prishṭhya, *hymn*, 222
prishṭhya-shaḍaha, 214
Pṛithivī-Jayasiṁha, Jayasiṁha I, *E. Chā. k.*, 112
Pṛithivīvyāghra, *Nishāda ch.*, 217, 223
Pṛithivīmahārāja, *p.n.*, 120
Pṛithivīmahārāja, *Rāmakēśyapa k.*, 89-90, 98, 100, 103-06, 109, 115, 192
Pṛithivīmūla, *fa.*, 61, 81, 94, 96, 98-99
Pṛithivīmūla (I), *ch.*, 95-96
Pṛithivīmūla, (II), *ch.*, 94-101 108, 182
Pṛithivīmūla, *ch.*, 18, 38-39, 66, 67, 69, 81, 84, 92, 108, 137, 143-44, 147
Pṛithivīmūla-rāja-vaṁśa, *fa.*, 173
Pṛithivīpati, *p.n.*, 105, 120
Pṛithivīrāja, *p.n.*, 120
Pṛithivīśarman, *scholar*, 103, 190
Pṛithivī-Śrīmūla, *i.e.*, Pṛithivī mūla (II) *ch* , 95. 186
Pṛithivīśvara, *Velanāṇḍu ch.*, 109
Pṛithivīshēṇa, *Vā. k.*, 51-52, 58, 78
Pṛithivīvallabha, *tit.*, 120-21
Pṛithivīyuvarāja (=duvarāja) *ch.*, 90, 106, 115-28, 137, 144, 152, 200
Pudur ins., 42
'Pūkivishaya' wr. reading of 'Pḷakivishaya' 77
Pulakēśi, *p.n.*, 28
Pulakēśi, (vallabha) *W. Chā. k.*, 15
Pulakēśi I, *W. Chā. k.*, 58, 70, 72, 75, 88, 112, 160, 243
Pulakēśi II, *W. Chā. k.*, 7, 10, 16, 75,84-86, 89-90, 104-06, 110, 113-16, 118-20, 137
Pulinda. *ruling cl.*, 209
Pulōmāvi, (*-mārī*), *n. of Indra*, 29
Puḷōmbūru, *vi.*, *s.a.* Polamūru 85, 112, 179, 199
Puḷumāvi II, *Sāta. k.*, 24, 28-29, 31, 76
Puṇḍarīka, *Pauṇḍarīka*, *sac.*, 161, 163, 169, 172
Puṇḍra, *myth. k.*, 25
Puṇḍra, *ruling cl.*, 21
Puṇḍravardhana, *pl. n.*, 22
Punnāḍ, *co.*, 105
puṇya-kriyā-vastu, *Bud. t.t.*, three and five of, 154, 156
purā, 'fortress', 136
Purāṇa, *lit.*, 19, 24-26, 29,

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

30, 34, 49, 104, 145, 192, 205-08, 211, 214, 234, 240
Pura-Nisaṅgama, *camp*, 65-66 166, 168
Puri Dt., 227
Puri pls., 27
Purle pls. of Dānārṇava's son Indravarman, 102, 189
Purṇāmāsa, sac., 27
purōhita, 'preceptor', 168
Puru, *fa.*, 30
Puru, *Purāṇic k.*, 25, 211
Purusha *i.e.*, Vishṇu, *g.*, 43
Purushamēdha, sac., 169, 172, 176, 213-14, 222
Pūrvādhigata-guṇa-viśvāyām upahṛitavaṁśa-śrī tit., 58
Purvāgrahārika 'former owner of *agrahāra*', 112
pūrv-āpar-Ākar-Āvantī, meaning of, 32
Pūrva-Nīmāṁsā-darśana, ph., 145-46, 152, 237
Pūrva-Nīmāṁsābhāshya, wk., 136
Purva-Mimāṁsa-sūtra, wk., 25 215, 238
pūrvaśāstra, 209
Purvōttara-Mīmāṁsās, ph., 146 152, 218, 222
Pushkara, *ci.*, 43
Pushpabhadra-svāmin te complex, 149
Pushpagiri, *vi.*, 232
Pushyabhūti, *dy.*, 44, 72, 74, 79
Pushyamitra, *Suṅga, k.*, 30, 76, 216
Pūtanā, *demoness*, 150

R

Raghu, *myth k., and dy.*, 21, 28, 244
Raghuvaṁśa, wk., 37
Raichur Dt., 32
Raipur Dt., 227
Raipur-Bilaspur-Sambalpur reg., 52
rājādhirāja, tit., 221
rājadrōhin, 132
Rājakula, off., 28
Rājakulabhaṭṭa, desi., and *n.*, 28
rājan, change of, at the end of compound, 203
rājan, n. ending, 16
Rājan, tit. 56, 65, 81, 85, 94, 97-98, 106, 117, 136
rājapurusha, off., 155
Rājarāja I, *E. Chā. k.*, 121
Rājarāja Chōḷa III, *Chōḷa k.*, 57
Rājarishis 'great Kshatriya rulers', 25
Rājaśēkhara, *poet*, 41, 233, 239-40, 243
Rājasiṁha, *Pal. k.* 152, 240
Rājasiṁha, tit., 102
Rājasthan, *st.*, 149
Rājasūya, Rājasūya-prādhirājya, sac., 169, 172, 176, 213, 215, 216, 219-20
rājātirāja, tit, 221
rājavaṁśa, ro. fa., 95
Rājayajña 'ro. sac.' 213
rājēndra, tit., 222
Rajim pls. 226
Rājmahal *l.*, 73
rāj-ōpēta-brāhmaṇas, 25
Rājput, *cl.*, 223
Rājya-saṁvasara (*-rambu*)' 'regnal y.', 170, 173, 183, 191, 193
Rājyaśrī, *Pushyabhūti pr*, 73
rājya-vijaya śrī-varsha, 'regnal y'., 195
rākshāsī, 'demoness', 150
Rāma, *epic hero*, 160, 216, 218-19
Ramachandrapuram tk, 46, 51, 85, 105, 176, 178 198
Rāmakāśyapa, *gōtra*, 51, 68, 84, 190, 192
Rāmakāśyapa (gōtrin) *fa.*, 69, 103-106
Rāmalēṇṇurāja, *off.*, 103-04, 191, 199
Rāmaliṅgēśvara *te.*, 157
Ramanapeta tk., 36, 153, 172
Rāmanapēṭa, *tn.*, 39
Ramaswami Sastri, V.A., 93
Ramanthapuram *ins.*, 209
Rāmatīrtham, *vi.*, 23, 66, 166
Ramatirtham pls., 2-5, 10, 12-14, 37, 45, 60, 68-70, 73, 85, 89, 102, 104, 220
Rāmāyaṇa, epic., 104, 145, 149 192, 216, 218-19
Raṇabhīta, tit., 102
raṇa-dīkshā, 49
Raṇadurja, *Rāmakāśyapa ch.*, 103-06, 109, 190, 192
Raṇajaya, ep., 240
Raṇamahāvikrama, ep., 201
Raṇavikrama, tit., 88
Raṇavikrama, *Bāṇa ch.*, 129
Rapson, 21, 22, 28-29, 134, 140, 205, 209
rāshṭra, t.d., 130, 132
rāshṭrakūṭa 'prov. governor'. 126
Rāshṭrakuṭa, *dy.*, 46-48, 53-59 61, 90. 113-14, 118, 125, 127, 135-36, 220, 231
rāshṭrakūta, off., 132, 137, 182, 186, 239
rāt, change of, at the end of Genitive singular, 203
ratha, ro. insignia, 243
rathakāra, community, 217
ratnas, seven of, 243
Rāvaṇavaho, wk., 61
Ravimahārāja, *s.a.* Ravivarman, *Kadamba k.*, 16
Rāvipāḍu, *vi.*, 232
Rāvirēla, *vi.*, 80
Rāvirēva, *i.e.*, Rāvirēla, *vi.*, 80, 92, 170
Ravivarman, *Kadamba k.*, 16, 43
Rayachaudhuri H.C., 31, 41, 72, 227
Razolu tk., 94, 96
Rēgōṇṛam, *vi.*; 80, 92, 170
Rēṅguṭa, *vi.*, 183
rēpha, superscript, 92
Retare Budrukh (Larger Retare), *vi.*, 46
Rēṭṭūraka, *s.a.* Retare Budrukh, *vi.*, 46, 162-63, 220
Rēvā, *i.e.*, Narmadā, *ri.*, 54, 71, 179, 240
Rēvasvāmin, *donee*,
Rēvatīdvīpa, *island*, 113
Rewa stone ins., of Karṇa, 68
Riddhapur pls. of Arthaptibhaṭṭāraka, 71, 77
Riddhapur pls. of Prabhāvatīguptā, 76

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Ṛigvēda, 144
Ṛishika, *co.*, 31–36, 41
Ṛishikanagara, *ci.*, 33
Ṛiśyamūka, *mt.*, 235
Rock Edict Fifth of Aśōka, 240
Rōhitagiri, *hill*, 209
rūḍyartha 'conventional meaning', 206
Rudra, n , 21-22
Rudra, Rudra-Śiva *g.*, 20-21, 219
Rudradāman I, *W. Kshatrapa k.*; 32, 41
Rudradatta, *au.*, 222
Rudradhara-bhaṭṭārikā, *Ujjain Ṣaka pr.*, 37, 79
Rudra-kuṇḍa, 20
Rudralōka, 170
Rudraśarman, *Brāhmaṇa*, 81, 85, 177, 179
Rudraśarman, *donee* 112
Rudrasēna II, *Ujjain Ṣaka k.*, 37, 79
Rudrasēna II, *Vā. pr.*, 37, 56
Rudrasvāmin, *donee*, 100

S

Sābara-bhya, wk., 222
Śabarasvāmin, *au.*, 136, 145, 215
Sabhāparvan, pt. of MB, 219
sabhya, 'member of council', 135
Śachī, *consort of Indra*, 195
sa-daṇḍa - kara-vishṭi-svōchchhishṭa-bhāga-bhōgāpradēya priv.; 155
Sadavahanakaḍa, 28
Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, *wk.*, 156
sag, Skt. root, 42
Sagamāna, *p.n.*, 33
Sagamāna, *Chuṭu k.*, 34
Sagara, *epic k.*, 162, 196, 217
sa-Garuḍa-Muraripu, i.e., 'Vishṇu mounted on Garuḍa', *crest*, 201
Sahādēvaratha, *monument*, 149
Sahasra, Sāhasra, sac., 214, 221
Sahasra, Sāhasra, collection of 1000 Vedic hymns, 145, 161 163
Sahasradakshiṇā, sac. fee, 214
Sahasradakshiṇ-Āgnishṭōma (-kratu), sac., 214
Suhasra-tārka 'a group of 1000 *tarkas*', 145-46
Sahasra-tārkaka, tit., 146, 195, 197
Sahasrayājin, tit., 214
Śahya, *mt.*, 206
Śaiiōdbhava, *dy.*, 205-08,
Śailōdbhava *ins.*, 19, 22
Sainyabhīta Mādhavarāja, *Śail. k.*, 228
Śaishikārtha, 209
Śaiva, Ṣaivism, *rel.*, 37, 40, 43-44, 55, 119, 141, 143
Śaiva deities, 141
sa-jātīya, meaning of, 26
Śaka, *era*, 9, 11, 48, 111, 114, 120, 144, 211, 226, 239
Śaka, *race*, 79, 92
Śaka, *ruling cl.*, 21
Śaka of Ujjayinī, *dy.*, 18
śaka, tree, 27
sakala-dharanī-tala, 'chakravarthi-kshētra', 240
Sakala-kalā-viśārada-satsabhā malla, cp., 117, 201
Sakalaśrīmat Āḷuvarsa, *Āḷupa k.*, 111
Śākhā, Vēdic di., 144, 237
Śakra (Indra), *g.*, 180, 190, 192
Śakrapura, *i.e.*, Indrapura, *ca* 81, 83, 174
Sakti; g., 205
Śaktivarman II, *E. Chā. k.*, 121, 128
Śakya, *dy., n.*, 27
Sālaṅkāyana, *dy* , 6, 19, 24, 36, 39-40, 49-50, 54, 57, 80, 92, 135, 168
Sālaṅkāyana, *gotra*, 46, 103, 161
Sālaṅkōyana charters, 76, 160
Saṁ, i.e., Saṁvatsara, 'regnal year', 164, 189, 199
samādhi, Bud. t.t., four of, 154, 156
samāpatti, Bud. t.t., nine of, 154, 156
sāmanta 'feu.,' 84, 92
sāmanta 'neighbouring ruler', 100
Sōmanta, *n.*, 102
Sāmantavarman, *E. Gaṅga k.*, 102
Sāmantasēna, *Sēna k.*, 30
Sāmānya-dharma 'common epithet', 4
sāmānya-Śāstra, 'general rule' 209
Sāmavēda, 103, 144-45, 236
sambhāra, Bud t.t., two of, 154, 156
Saṁhita, Vedic di., 145
sampad, sampad-upāsanā, meditation, 218-19
sāmrājya-chihna 'ro. insignia', 243
samrāṭ, tit., 34
Samudragupta, *Gupta k.*, 19, 27, 119, 216
saṁva, saṁvatsara 'regnal' *y.*, 165, 177
Saṁvatsara, meaning of, 218
sanātana-dharma, Vēdic rel. 141, 161
Sāñchi, *l.*, 22
Sāndhivigrahika, off., 131-32, 189
saṅga, saṅgama, sanonyms, 77
Saṅgam, *l.*, 66, 73
Śaṅgam age, 19
Saṅgamāna. *p.n.*, 33
Saṅgha, 39, 154, 156
sanidhi, priv., 155
saṅkalpa, rite, 222
Śankara, *ph.*, 26 30, 163, 223
Saṅkarsha-kaṇḍa, wk., 25, 246
Saṅkha, figure on the coin, 134
Sānkhya (-darśana), *ph.*, 146, 152
Sāṅkhyakārikā, wk, 151, 152
Sāṅkhya-tattvas, 152
Sannathi, *l.*, 28
Sanskrit, *la.*, 21, 22, 28-29, 38 41, 56, 153, 184, 232-33, 239
Sanskrit metrics, 146
Santa-Bommali pls. of Indravarman II, y. 87, 108
santati 'family', 19
Sāntidēva, *au.*, 143
Śāntiparvan, pt. of MB, 30, 218, 223
sapta, 200
Saptāha, sac., 214
Sapta Ṛishayah, 'Seven Sages' 26, 30

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Saptati i.e., Sāṁkhyakārikā, wk., 152
Sarabha, *Sara. k.*, 228
Śarabhapura, *ca.*, 228
Śarabhapurīya, *dy.*, 228
Śarad, 'autumnal seasons', 204
saras, 'lake', 119
Sārdūlavikrīḍita, metre, 175
Sarma, M.S., 15, 239
Sarasvati, *g.*, 150
Śarmishṭhā, *Asura pr.*, 212
sarva-bādhā-parihāra, priv., 173
sārvabhauma 'emperor', 46, 48, 53, 161
sarva-dāna-sahita, prlv., 173
sarva-dāna-viśuddha, priv., 162
sarva-dvīpa-bhuk, ep., 241
Sarvajyōtis, sac.., 214
sarvakara-parihāra, priv., 160, 179, 189, 199
sarva-kara-bhara-vimukta, priv., 166
Sarvamēdha, sac., 169, 172, 176, 213, 214
Sarvamēdha-āvāpta-sarvabhūta svārājya, tit., 176, 214
sarva parihāra, priv, 186
sarvā pṛithivī, sava-puṭhavī, 'chakravarttikshētra' 240
Sarvasiddhi, tit., 138
Sarvasiddhidatṭi, gift., 112, 138, 181
Sarvātōbhadra, type of building, 204
Śarvavarman, *Mau. k.*, 74
śāsana-nisarga 'delivery of edict' 167
Saśāṅka, *Gauḍa k.*, 228
Śaśin, (the moon), 202
Śaśiśēkhara, *g.*, 150
Śāstra, lit., 130, 236
Sātakarṇi, *fa.*, 21
Sātakarṇi, tit., 23, 28, 207
Satakarṇi, *s.a.* Sātavāhana k. 33, 42
Sātakarṇi, I, *Sāta. k.*, 59
Satapatha, Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, Vēdic di., 214, 217, 240
Satara Dt., 46-48, 161
Satara pls. of the 8th *y.* of Pulakēśi II, 114, 120, 121
satata-gō-bhūmi etc., *ep.*, 97
Sātavāhana, (-na kula), *i.e*, Andhra, *dy.*, 1, 18, 19, 23, 24, 28, 29, 33, 49, 59, 76, 147, 205, 207-09
Sātavāhana coins, 33
Sātavāhana empire., 33, 34
satmī-bhūta, sātmya, 'meaning of', 173, 175
Śatrumallēśvara, *n.*, 151
Satsabhamālla, *exp. as n.*, 127
Sattanapalle tk., 64, 157
Sattanapalle-Guṇṭur reg., 83
Sattanapalle-Narasaraopeṭ reg., 63
Saturn, *planet*, 163
satya-dharma-saṁsthita, tit., 162
Satyasēna, *au.*, 34
Satyasēna, *k.*, 34, 42, 237
Satyāshāḍha-śrautasūtra, wk., 215
Satyāśraya, tit., 13, 75, 81, 113, 130, 172
Satyāśraya-Dhruvarāja Indravarman, *W. Chā. pr.*, 75
Satyāśraya-Srī-Pṛithivīvallaibha mahārāja, *i.e.*, Pulakēś II, *W. Chā. k.*, 110, 111, 194
Saundaranandana, wk., 27
Sāvitṛi, *myth. chara.*, 195, 196
Sawai Sayasingh of Amber, *Rajput k.*, 217
Sāyaṇa, *au.*, 93, 214, 217, 220, 222-23
Seasons :
autumn, 119, 204
rainy, 62, 94
summer, 46, 80, 83, 112
Gi. Gihma, Giṁhā, Grīshma, 'summer' 160, 170, 171, 199
Grī, i.e., Grīshma, 'summer' 177
Śarad 'autumn', 204
Vāsa, Varshā 'rainy', 183, 184
Vasanta 'spring', 233
Śeḍa(or ṭa)giri, *mt.*, 206, 209
Sēḍagiriyas, *peo.* 207
Sēṇavaryya, *l.*, 8, 161
Śēsha, *myth. k., of snakes*, 200
sētu, meaning of, 163
Sētu, *Rāma's bridge*, 243
Sētubandha, wk., 37, 60
'seven', denoting 'indefinite plurality' 127
Sewell, Robert, 15, 80
shaḍ-vidha (bala), 'six-fold forces', 122, 128
shaṭ-karma 'six-fold duties', 161, 163
Shōḍaśin, sac., 163, 169, 213, 220
Śibi, *epic k.*, 141
Siddhāntakaumudī, wk., 28, 42, 125
Siddhikshētra, *sacred place*, 205
śikshā, Bud. t.t. three of, 154-55
Sikshāsamuchchaya, wk., 143
Śīla, Bud. t.t., three of, 154, 156
sima, sīmā, 'boundary', 181
Siṁha, *i.e.* Siṁhavarman II, *Pal. k.*, 81-82, 85, 93, 174
Siṁhala, *co.*, 234
Simhala *Vihara, Bud. mon.*, 143
Siṁhavarman, *Pal. k.*, 43, 50, 66
Siṁhavarman of Jalālpuram pls.; *Pal. k.*, 82
Siṁhavarman II, *Pal. k.*, 82, 83, 85, 115, 123
Siṁhavikrama, ep., 196
siṁhavikrānta, ep., 194
Siṁhavishṇu, *Pal. k.*, 84-85, 93, 118
Siprā, *ri.*, 203
Sircar, D.C. 4, 24, 31, 76, 80, 109, 189, 220, 224, 227, 231, 239
Siri Sātakarṇi, *Sāta. k.*, 24
Siriṭana, Srīparvata, *mt.*, 206, 209, 233
Sirpur ins. of Mahāśivagupta 227-28
Śiśuka, *Andhra k.*, 30
Śiśupāla, *epic villain*, 216, 219
Sitētara-Bēṇṇa, *i.e.*, Kṛishṇa-Bēṇṇā, Krishṇā, *ri.*, 117, 119, 200
Sitētara-Bēṇṇa-nātha, ep., 200
Śiva, *g.*, 21, 40, 57, 75, 80, 89, 101, 117, 119, 127, 141-42, 148-50, 205-06, 221, 232

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Śivala-kula, *fa.*, 21-22, 33-34
Sivalānanda, tit., 21, 33
Siva-liṅga, figure of, 204
Siva-Mallikarjuna, *g.*, 37, 206
Śivaramamurti, g., 150
Sivaśarman, *donee*, 85, 179, 199
Sivaśarman, *Brāhmaṇa*, 112
Sivaskandavarman, *Pal. k.*, 119
Siva te., 148, 231
Śīyamaṅgalam Cave te. of Mahēndravarman I, 84, 148
Skanda-Kārttikēya, *g.*, 37, 88
Skāndapurāṇa, wk., 234
Skandakuṇḍi, *n.*, 28, 22
Skandaśishya, *Pal, k.*, 34, 42, 50, 236-37
Skandavarman, *Nala k.*, 43, 71, 77-78, 82
Skandavarman II, *Pal. k.*, 58
Skandavarman II, of Oṅgōḍu grt., *Pal. k.*, 82
Skandavarman, *Sālaṅkāyana k.*, 168
Skandhāvāra, '*military camp*', 157, 159, 192, 198
Slēsha, Slēshālaṅkāra, fig. of speech, 85, 146, 180, 224
Smith, V.A , 24, 134
smṛiti, meaning of, 160
Smṛiti, lit., 25, 43, 103, 130-36, 141, 144, 161, 174, 182, 185, 190, 222, 243
snāna-puṇyōdaka-pavitṛśkṛita-śiras, tit., 166, 220
society, four-fold di,, of, 136
solar symbol, *representation on the seal*, 176
Sōma, *g.*, 20
Sōma, *creeper*, 215, 222
Sōma, sac., 214
Sōmagirē (or rī)śvarānātha, *g.*, 80-81, 141, 147-50, 170, 171
Sōmagiri, *hill*, 81
Sōmagirīsvarā, *i.e.*, Pārvati, *g.*, 141
Sōma-kuṇḍa, 20
Sōmasaṁstha, sac., 214
Sōmāskanda, *g.*, 149
Sōmavaṁśi, *s.a.*, Pāṇḍuvaṁśi, *dy.*, 72, 224
Sōmavikṛiti, type of sac., 214
Sōmēśvara I, *Cha. k.*, 236
Sōmēśvara, Bhaṭṭa, *au.*, 237
sōpanidhi, priv., 155
South Kanara Dt., 111
Southern Class of alphabets, 153
Southern Wind, 233-34
South Kōsala, *coa.*, 52, 56
Srauta, Srauta-sūtra, lit., 144, 213-14, 216-217, 218, 220, 222
śrauta sac., 145, 214
Srāvaka-yāna, doctrine, 143, 156
Śrēni, '*guild*', 133, 139
Śri, honorific, 45
Śri, *i.e.*, Laxmī, *g.*, 173, 175
Śrī-Bala, *scribe*, 163
Śrīchara, *au.*, 127
Śrīkāulam area., 89
Śrīkākulam *tn.*, 100, 102
Śrikakulam Dt., 51, 54, 66, 69, 100, 102, 104, 105, 130, 188
Śrīkākulm reg., 101
Śrīkuṇḍa, pl. n., 22
Śri-Mādava-varmmā, legend on seal, 159, 164
Śrī-Mūla, *Pri. ch.*, 81, 84, 95, 96, 97, 98, 174
Śṛingāraśēkhara, *lit. chara.*, 242
Śrīnidhi, ep., 240
Srīpāla, *scribe*, 162
Śrīpavata, n., 209
Śrīparvata, Śrīśailam, *hills*, 18-20, 34-36, 45, 54, 61, 75, 81, 84, 143, 205-07
Srī-Pārvata (-tēya), *fa.*, 9, 19, 44, 173
Śrīparavatasvāmin i.e., Mallikalārjuna, g., 35, 38, 139, 141, 159, 164, 166, 169, 172, 176, 178, 219
Śrīparavata-svāmi-pādānudhyāta, tit., 40
Śrī Pārvatēya, ep., 19
Śrīparvatīya Andhra, *s.a.*, Chutu, *dy.*, 19, 33, 34, 205-09
Śrīparvatīa chiefs, 35
Śripati, *i.e.*, Vishṇu and Vishṇuvadhana 1, 93
Śrīpītha, sacred, place, 205
Śrī-Prithivī-Jayasiṁha, *i.e.*, Jayasiṁha I, 198
Śrīprithivīvallabh, tit., 108
Śrī-Lanamahāvikrama, ep. 117
Śrīsailam, *hills*, 8, 19, 31, 36-37, 40, 141, 205-06
Śriśaṭlam te., 206
Śrīśila(-sthala)māhātmya, wk., 35-36, 59
Śrīvallabha, tit., 108, 204
Srī-Vikramah, coin legend, 55
Sruit, lit., 103, 141, 144, 161, 172, 174, 182, 185-186, 190, 218
sthāna i.e.., ghatikā-sthāna, 74, 112
sthira-karman, qualification, 221, 223
stihi, 43, 155
sthitr=ēshā sthāpita, meaning of, 38
sthiti-sthāpanā, 43
stōtra, 'hyman' 222
stūpa-chaitya, 81, 149, 173
Subandhu, *au.*, 180, 206, 221, 242
Subba Rao, R, 15, 189
Subhāshitratnakośa, wk., 204 204, 235
Subramanian, K.R., 66
Subrahmaṇya te., 125
Subrahmanya Aiyer K.V., Aiyer K.V.S., 116, 118, 126
Sudēvarāja, Śara. k., 228
śudra, 'person full of grief' 26
Śūdraka, *lit. chara.*, 160, 196
Sugata, *i.e.*, the Buddha, *rel. teacher*, 61, 172
Sugrīva, *epic. chara.*, 209
Śukanāsa, *lit. chara.*, 163
Śukla, 'bright fortnight' 192
Śukra, (i.e., Venus) *au* , and *planet*, 180
Śukrāchārya, *preceptor of Asuras*, 211
Sūktimutāvali, wk., 204
Śūla, figure above ins., 204
Śūla, figure on the coin., 134
Śūlikas id., with Chōḷas, 79
Sulikas, id., with Śulkis of Orissa, 73
Śūlikas, id, with the W. Chal., 72
Suṁha, *myth. k.*, 25
Summer season, 112

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Saptati i.e., Sāṅkhyakārikā, wk., 152
Sarabha, *Sara. k.*, 228
Śarabhapura, *ca.*, 228
Śarabhapurīya, *dy.*, 228
Śarad, 'autumnal seasons', 204
saras, 'lake', 119
Sārdūlavikrīḍita, metre, 175
Sarma, M.S., 15, 239
Sarasvati, *g.*, 150
Śarmishṭhā, *Asura pr.*, 212
sarva-bādhā-parihāra, priv., 173
sārvabhauma 'emperor', 46, 48, 53, 161
sarva-dāna-sahita, prlv., 173
sarva-dāna-viśuddha, priv., 162
sarva-dvīpa-bhuk, ep., 241
Sarvajyōtis, sac.., 214
sarvakara-parihāra, priv., 160, 179, 189, 199
sarva-kara-bhara-vimukta, priv., 166
Sarvamēdha, sac., 169, 172, 176, 213, 214
Sarvamēdha-āvāpta-sarvabhūta svārājya, tit., 176, 214
sarva parihāra, priv, 186
sarvā pṛithivī, sava-puṭhavī, '*chakravarttikshētra*' 240
Sarvasiddhi, tit., 138
Sarvasiddhidaṭṭi, gift., 112, 138, 181
Sarvātōbhadra, type of building, 204
Śarvavarman, *Mau. k.*, 74
śāsana-nisarga 'delivery of edict' 167
Saśāṅka, *Gauḍa k.*, 228
Śaśin, (the moon), 202
Śaśiśēkhara, *g.*, 150
Śāstra, lit., 130, 236
Sātakarṇi, *fa.*, 21
Sātakarṇi, tit., 23, 28, 207
Satakarṇi, *s.a.* Sātavāhana k. 33, 42
Sātakarṇi, I, *Sāta. k.*, 59
Satapatha, Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, Vēdic di., 214, 217, 240
Satara Dt., 46-48, 161
Satara pls. of the 8th *y.* of Pulakēśi II, 114, 120, 121
satata-gō-bhūmi etc., *ep.*, 97
Sātavāhana, (-na kula), *i.e*, Andhra, *dy.*, 1, 18, 19, 23, 24, 28, 29, 33, 49, 59, 76, 147, 205, 207-09
Sātavāhana coins, 33
Sātavāhana empire., 33, 34
satmī-bhūta, sātmya, 'meaning of', 173, 175
Śatrumallēśvara, *n.*, 151
Satsabhamālla, *exp. as n.*, 127
Sattanapalle tk., 64, 157
Sattanapalle-Guṇṭur reg., 83
Sattanapalle-Narasaraopeṭ reg., 63
Saturn, *planet*, 163
satya-dharma-saṁsthita, tit., 162
Satyasēna, *au.*, 34
Satyasēna, *k.*, 34, 42, 237
Satyāshāḍha-śrautasūtra, wk., 215
Satyāśraya, tit., 13, 75, 81, 113, 130, 172
Satyāśraya-Dhruvarāja Indravarman, *W. Chā. pr.*, 75
Satyāśraya-Srī-Pṛithivīvallaibha mahārāja, *i.e.*, Pulakēś II, *W. Chā. k.*, 110, 111, 194
Saundaranandana, wk., 27
Sāvitṛi, *myth. chara.*, 195, 196
Sawai Sayasingh of Amber, *Rajput k.*, 217
Sāyaṇa, *au.*, 93, 214, 217, 220, 222-23
Seasons :
autumn, 119, 204
rainy, 62, 94
summer, 46, 80, 83, 112
Gi. Gihma, Giṁhā, Grīshma, 'summer' 160, 170, 171, 199
Grī, i.e., Grīshma, 'summer' 177
Śarad 'autumn', 204
Vāsa, Varshā 'rainy', 183, 184
Vasanta 'spring', 233
Śeḍa(or ṭa)giri, *mt.*, 206, 209
Sēḍagiriyas, *peo.* 207
Sēṇavaryya, *l.*, 8, 161
Śēsha, *myth. k., of snakes*, 200
sētu, meaning of, 163
Sētu, *Rāma's bridge*, 243
Sētubandha, wk., 37, 60
'seven', denoting 'indefinite plurality' 127
Sewell, Robert, 15, 80
shaḍ-vidha (*bala*), 'six-fold forces', 122, 128
shaṭ-karma 'six-fold duties', 161, 163
Shōḍaśin, sac., 163, 169, 213, 220
Śibi, *epic k.*, 141
Siddhāntakaumudī, wk., 28, 42, 125
Siddhikshētra, *sacred place*, 205
śikshā, Bud. t.t. three of, 154-55
Sikshāsamuchchaya, wk., 143
śīla, Bud. t.t., three of, 154, 156
sima, sīmā, 'boundary', 181
Siṁha, *i.e.* Siṁhavarman II, *Pal. k.*, 81-82, 85, 93, 174
Siṁhala, *co.*, 234
Simhala *Vihara, Bud. mon.*, 143
Siṁhavarman, *Pal. k.*, 43, 50, 66
Siṁhavarman of Jalālpuram pls.; *Pal. k.*, 82
Siṁhavarman II, *Pal. k.*, 82, 83, 85, 115, 123
Siṁhavikrama, ep., 196
siṁhavikrānta, ep., 194
Siṁhavishṇu, *Pal. k.*, 84-85, 93, 118
Siprā, *ri.*, 203
Sircar, D.C. 4, 24, 31, 76, 80, 109, 189, 220, 224, 227, 231, 239
Siri Sātakarṇi, *Sāta. k.*, 24
Siriṭana, Srīparvata, *mt.*, 206, 209, 233
Sirpur ins. of Mahāśivagupta 227-28
Śiśuka, *Andhra k.*, 30
Śiśupāla, *epic villain*, 216, 219
Sitētara-Bēṇṇa, *i.e.*, Kṛishṇa-Bēṇṇā, Krishṇā, *ri.*, 117, 119, 200
Sitētara-Bēṇṇa-nātha, ep., 200
Śiva, *g.*, 21, 40, 57, 75, 80, 89, 101, 117, 119, 127, 141-42, 148-50, 205-06, 221, 232

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Śivala-kula, *fa.*, 21-22, 33-34
Sivalānanda, tit., 21, 33
Siva-liṅga, figure of, 204
Siva-Mallikarjuna, *g.*, 37, 206
Śivaramamurti, g., 150
Sivaśarman, *donee*, 85, 179, 199
Sivaśarman, *Brāhmaṇa*, 112
Sivaskandavarman, *Pal. k.*, 119
Siva te., 148, 231
Sīyamaṅgalam Cave te. of Mahēndravarman I, 84, 148
Skanda-Kārttikēya, *g.*, 37, 88
Skāndapurāṇa, wk., 234
Skandakuṇḍi, *n.*, 28, 22
Skandaśishya, *Pal, k.*, 34, 42, 50, 236-37
Skandavarman, *Nala k.*, 43, 71, 77-78, 82
Skandavarman II, *Pal. k.*, 58
Skandavarman II, of Oṅgōḍu grt., *Pal. k.*, 82
Skandavarman, *Sālaṅkāyana k.*, 168
Skandhāvāra, '*military camp*', 157, 159, 192, 198
Slēsha, Slēshālaṅkāra, fig. of speech, 85, 146, 180, 224
Smith, V.A , 24, 134
smṛiti, meaning of, 160
Smṛiti, lit., 25, 43, 103, 130-36, 141, 144, 161, 174, 182, 185, 190, 222, 243
snāna-puṇyōdaka-pavitrīkṛita-Śiras, tit., 166, 220
society, four-fold di,, of, 136
solar symbol, *representation on the seal*, 176
Sōma, *g.*, 20
Sōma, *creeper*, 215, 222
Sōma, sac., 214
Sōmagirē (or rī)śvarānātha, *g.*, 80-81, 141, 147-50, 170, 171
Sōmagiri, *hill*, 81
Sōmagirīsvarā, *i.e.*, Pārvati, *g.*, 141
Sōma-kuṇḍa, 20
Sōmasaṁstha, sac., 214
Sōmāskanda, *g.*, 149
Sōmavaṁśi, *s.a.*, Pāṇḍuvaṁśi, *dy.*, 72, 224
Sōmavikṛiti, type of sac., 214
Sōmēśvara I, *Cha. k.*, 236
Sōmēśvara, Bhaṭṭa, *au.*, 237
sōpanidhi, priv., 155
South Kanara Dt., 111
Southern Class of alphabets, 153
Southern Wind, 233-34
South Kōsala, *coa.*, 52, 56
Srauta, Srauta-sūtra, lit., 144, 213-14, 216-217, 218, 220, 222
śrauta sac., 145, 214
Srāvaka-yāna, doctrine, 143, 156
Śrēni, '*guild*', 133, 139
Śri, honorific, 45
Śri, *i.e.*, Laxmī, *g.*, 173, 175
Śrī-Bala, *scribe*, 163
Śrīehara, *au.*, 127
Śrīkāulam area., 89
Śrīkākulam *tn.*, 100, 102
Śrikakulam Dt., 51, 54, 66, 69, 100, 102, 104, 105, 130, 188
Śrīkākulm reg., 101
Śrīkuṇḍa, pl. n., 22
Śri-Mādava-varmmā, legend on seal, 159, 164
Śrī-Mūla, *Pri. ch.*, 81, 84, 95, 96, 97, 98, 174
Śṛingāraśēkhara, *lit. chara.*, 242
Śrīnidhi, ep., 240
Srīpāla, *scribe*, 162
Śrīpavata, n., 209
Śrīparvata, Śrīśailam, *hills*, 18-20, 34-36, 45, 54, 61, 75, 81, 84, 143, 205-07
Srī-Pārvata (-tēya), *fa.*, 9, 19, 44, 173
Śrīparavatasvāmin i.e., Mallikalārjuna, g., 35, 38, 139, 141, 159, 164, 166, 169, 172, 176, 178, 219
Śrīparavata-svāmi-pādānudhyāta, tit., 40
Śrī Pārvatēya, ep., 19
Śrīparvatīya Andhra, *s.a.*, Chutu, *dy.*, 19, 33, 34, 205-09
Śrīparvatīa chiefs, 35
Śripati, *i.e.*, Vishṇu and Vishṇuvadhana 1, 93
Śrīpītha, sacred, place, 205
Śrī-Prithivī-Jayasiṁha, *i.e.*, Jayasiṁha I, 198
Śrīprithivīvallabh, tit., 108
Śrī-Lanamahāvikrama, ep. 117
Śrīsailam, *hills*, 8, 19, 31, 36-37, 40, 141, 205-06
Śriśaṭlam te., 206
Śrīśila(-sthala)māhātmya, wk., 35-36, 59
Srīvallabha, tit., 108, 204
Srī-Vikramah, coin legend, 55
Sruit, lit., 103, 141, 144, 161, 172, 174, 182, 185-186, 190, 218
sthāna i.e.., ghatikā-sthāna, 74, 112
sthira-karman, qualification, 221, 223
stihi, 43, 155
sthitr=ēshā sthāpita, meaning of, 38
sthiti-sthāpanā, 43
stōtra, 'hyman' 222
stūpa-chaitya, 81, 149, 173
Subandhu, *au.*, 180, 206, 221, 242
Subba Rao, R, 15, 189
Subhāshitratnakośa, wk., 204 204, 235
Subramanian, K.R., 66
Subrahmaṇya te., 125
Subrahmanya Aiyer K.V., Aiyer K.V.S., 116, 118, 126
Sudēvarāja, Śara. k., 228
Śudra, 'person full of grief' 26
Śūdraka, *lit. chara.*, 160, 196
Sugata, *i.e.*, the Buddha, *rel. teacher*, 61, 172
Sugrīva, *epic. chara.*, 209
Śukanāsa, *lit. chara.*, 163
Śukla, 'bright fortnight' 192
Śukra, (i.e., Venus) *au* , and *planet*, 180
Śukrāchārya, *preceptor of Asuras*, 211
Śūktimutāvali, wk., 204
Śūla, figure above ins., 204
Śūta, figure on the coin., 134
Śūlikas id., with Chōḷas, 79
Sulikas, id., with Śulkis of Orissa, 73
Śūlikas, id, with the W. Chal., 72
Suṁha, *myth. k.*, 25
Summer season, 112

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Sun, *graha*, 163
Sun, representation of, on the seal, 159
Śuṅga, *dy.*, 26, 30, 76, 209, 216
Supratīka, *elephant*, 68, 97, 99 108, 183
supreme commander of army 134
surā-pāna, sin., 214
Sūrāshṭra, *co.*, 127
Sūryasiddhānta, wk., 238
Sūryavarman, *Magadha k.*, 227-28
Sūryavarman, *Mau. k.*, 227
Suśarman, *Kāṇvāyana k.*, 30
Suśruta-saṁhitā, wk., 175
susthirakarman, tit., 156, 221
Sūta, cte., 211
Sūtaputra, member of sūta cte., 211
sūtra, type of composition, 91 93, 145
sutyā, sac. rite, 214-15
sutyāhas, d. of sac., 218
Suvarchalā, consort of the Sun-g., 195
Suvarṇamukhī, *ri.*, 66
svādhyaya 'Vedic study', 164
Svāhā, *consort of g. Agni*, 195
Svāmi-Mahāsēna, *g.*, 37, 194
svāmin, n. ending. 136
Svāmirāja, *Khāndēsh k.*, 41, 181
Svāmirāja's pls. of *y.* 322, seal of, 180
Svāmiśarman, *donee*, 81, 177
svārājya, 'supremacy' 169, 214-15
Svargamāna, *p.n.*, 33, 42
svārthika-pratyaya, Skt suffix, 29
Śvastika, *sym.*, 23
Śvētagiri, *hill.*, 209
Svētātapatra, ro. insignia, 243

T

t, final omitted, 160
Taddhita suffix, 171
Tāḍināḍu, *vi.*, 103
Tāḍiparru, *vi.*, 103
Tagara, *l.*, 26
Taisha (Pausha), *month*, 45
Taittirīya (—riyaka), *Vēdic śākhā*, 65, 85, 104, 112, 144, 152, 166, 179, 192, 199
takra-Kauṇḍinya-nyāya, 209
Talagunda ins. of Mṛigēśvarman, 21, 27, 35, 43, 238
Talakāḍ, *ca.*, 105, 128
Tālavṛintanivāsin, *au.*, 222
Tāḷupāka, *ca.*, 96, 130
Taḷupāka *vishaya, di.*, 94-95, 182, 186
Tambatīrtha, *holy centre*, 162, 220
Tāmbraparṇi, *i.e.*, Ceylon *co.* 95, 143
Tāmbraparṇīya, *rel, community*, 95, 187
Tamil, *co.*, 19, 143
Tamil, *la.*, 196
Tamil ins., 127
Tāmrakāśyapa, *gōtra*, 105
Tāmraparṇī, *ri.*, 233
tāmra-śāsana, 166
Tāṇḍivāḍa *vi.*, 103, 190
Tāṇḍivāḍa grt., 90, 103-04, 109, 128
Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa, Taṇḍya-mahā-brāhmaṇa, Vedic di., 214
Tantravārttika, wk., 238
Tāntrika, tit., 17, 205-06
Tanuku tk., 103, 111
Tārā, *g.*, 206
Tārānātha, *au.*, 205
Tārāpīḍa, *lit, chara.*, 242
tarka, s.a darśana, 145
Tarkabhāshā, wk., 16
tarka, eighty of, 110
Tarka-śāstra, 145
Tathāgata *i.e.* the Buddha, 155
Tāṭipāka, *vi.*, 94-95
Tāṭipāka-sīma, *i.e.* Nagaram island, 94
Tātparyaṭīkā, wk., 151
Tatpurusha, Skt. compound, 41
taxes, two fold division of, 137
Tekkali, *tn.*, 100, 102, 188
Tekkali, *tn.*, 100, 102, 188
Telengana, *di.*, 31
Telugu, *la.*, 18, 21, 56, 196
Telugu Chōḍa, *dy.*, 23, 76
Telugu ep. of Mahēndravarman I, 84
Telugu ins., 171
Tenali tk., 159, 164
Te-na-ka-che-ka, i.e., Dhānya kaṭaka, *co.*, 119
Tewar, *tn.*, 18, 224
Thēriya, *Bud. sect.*, 143
Thomas, 221
Tibetan, 17, 205
Tilaka, com. 223
Timmapuram pls. of Kubja Vishṇuvardhana I, 104, 128
Tirlingi fragmentary pls. *y.* 88, 108
tīrtha, 46
Tiruchirapalli Dt., 30
Tiruchirapalli Cave of Mahēndravarman I, 118
Tirumalai, 'Tirupati hills' 208
Tirumalai, 'holy hill', 208-09
Tiruvellarai ins., 30
Tiruvūru, *t.n.*, 46, 80 ,83, 223
Tīvara, (—radēva), *Pāṇ. k.*, 56, 72, 224, 226-29
Tiwaikhed pls. of Nannarāja, 114
Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam, *co.*, 148
Traikūṭaka, *dy.*, 20, 27, 52, 63 232
trans-Gōdāvarī reg., 105
trans-Kṛishṇā reg., 123
Travancore Hills, 233
Travancore reg., 233
treacherous battle, 135
Trikaliṅga, *div.*, 100
Trikaliṅgādhipati, tit., 100, 188
Trikōṭīśvara, Trikūṭa, Trikūṭēśvara, *n. of Siva te.*, 231-32
Trikūṭa, Trikūṭaparvata, *mt.*- 18, 27, 39, 52, 63-65, 76, 119 127, 231-34
Trikūṭa, proper noun, 233
Trikūṭa=Kōṭappakoṇḍa identification, 232
Trikūṭ-Malaya, Dvandva compound, 233
Trikūṭa-Malayādhipati, tit., 5, 48, 52, 61, 63-64, 122, 164, 231-32
Trikūta-parvata, Karmadhāraya compound, 233
Trikūṭaparvatapati, tit., 63, 117-18, 200, 231-32
Trikūṭēśvara, *i.e.*, Śiva, 232
Trikūṭēśvara te., 232

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Trimūrtis, *g.*, 148
Triparvata, wr. reading of '*Srīparvata*', 42
triple formula (of the Mahāyānism), 143
Tripurī, *ca.*, 224, 225
Trisahasra-vidyā, a collection of 3,000 Vedic hymns, 103, 145, 190, 191
Trivara, *Pāṇ. k.*, 224, 226
Trivaranagara, *s.a.* Tiruvūru, *ca.*, 18, 46, 52, 56, 80, 83, 88-89, 130, 137, 159, 224-25 229
Trivaranagara-bhavara-gata-yuvati-hṛidaya-nandana tit., 5, 12, 52, 56-57, 72, 178 224, 226, 229, 242
trivarṇas, 'first three castes', 140
trivēda, tit., 145
Triyambaka, Tryambaka, *i.e.* Śiva, the three-eyed, 141, 170, 171
Trulparu, 186
Tulā, *sign of zodiac*, 163
Tuḷuva co., 111
Tummalaguḍem, *vi.*, 9, 36,38-40, 81, 83, 153, 172
Tummalagudem records, 1, 142, 143, 146
Tummalagudem pls. Set I, 9, 10, 13, 14, 31, 36-38, 40, 45, 81, 139
Tummalagudem pls. Set II, 9-11, 13, 16, 19, 36-40, 51, 60, 66, 67, 81-84, 92, 95-96, 113, 240, 226
Tūṇḍi, *vi.*, 81, 82, 135, 177
Tūṇi, *di.*, 81, 169
Tūṇi, *l.*, 82
'Twenty', *wk.*, 103

U

U & da, confusion between, 58
Ubhaya-kul-ālaṅkārabhūtā, tit., 60
Ubhaya-vaṁś-ālankāra - bhūta, tit., 60, 166
Udayachandra, *Pal gen.*, 97, 100, 203, 217
Udayagiri Cave ins. of Chandragupta II, 92
Udayendiram pls. of Nandivarman Pallavamalla, 97 217
Udayendiram charters of Nandivarman I & II, 43, 44
Udit-ōdit-ānvaya, kula, meaning of, 166, 168
Udumbara, tree, 27
Ujjayini, *ca.*, 18, 203
Ujjain symbol, 42
Ukthya, sac., 169, 171, 213-14, 220
Ulagamuḷuḍuḍaiyāḷ, n. of Chōḷa q., 203
Umāmahēśvara, *g.*, 141, 150
u-mātrā, 158
uñchha-vṛitti, 127
Uṇḍavalli Caves, sculptures in, 84
Uṇḍavalli cave te., 147, 152
Uṇḍivāṭikā grt., 53, 57, 88
U.P., *St.*, 71
Upachāra, (*-ravat*), '*metaphorcal usage*,' 27, 223
Upādhyāya-kula, *community*, 94, 183
Upjaāti, metre, 175
upanidhi, 'deposit', 133
Upanishad, lit., 26, 103, 141, 144, 190
Upasad, sac., 214
upāyas, traditional four-fold div. of, 135
Upēndragiri, p. n., 22
Upēndravajrā, metre, 196
Ūrdhvajānu, pose, 149
Urlam pls. of Gaṅga y. 80, 102, 108
Urubhās; *i.e.* the Sun, 180
Uruvapalli pls. of Vishṇugōpa, 58
Uśanas, *i.e.* Śukra, *au.*, 180
Ushavadata, *Saka ch*, 237
Utpalabhaṭṭa, *au.*, 41
utpādita-mahābōdhi-chitta, ep., 142, 154
Utpattipiḍigu, biruda, 147
Uttamāśraya, biruda, 60, 81, 84, 172, 174
Uttaṅka, *sage*, 236
Uttaramerur ins., 238
Uttararāmacharita, drama, 216
Uttara-Mīmāṁsā, i.e., *Vēdāntadarśana, ph.*, 146, 218

V

V, Pal. & Chā. types of, 116
vachana-prēshana, meaning of, 166, 168
vachana-preshana s.a. (?) *vishṭi*, 137
Vāchaspati Miśra, *au.* 151
Vadura, *vi.*, 111
Vagadhīśvari, *i e.* Pārvatī, *g.*, 171
vaidikas, 152
Vaidika-darsana, six of, 145-46
Vaijayantī, *ca.*, (?), 113
Vaiṅgēyaka, dy. n., 19, 20
Vainya, *myth. k.*, 195, 196
Vaiśākha, *month*, 39, 100, 154, 163
Vaisākhī-Pūrṇimā, 39
vaiśāradya, Bud. t t., four kinds of, 15, 143, 154-55
Vaiśēshika, Vaiśēshika-darśana, *ph.*, 145
Vaiśēshika, *ph.*, *padārthas* of 151
Vaishṇava, *sect*, 151
Vaishṇava deity, 142
Vaishṇukuṇḍika, 20
Vaiśya, *cte.*, 25
Vaiyērakara, *di.*, 81, 82, 177
Vājapēya, sac., 169, 172, 213, 220
Vājeshka (Vasishka), *Kushāṇa, k.*, 47
Vajraghaṇḍa, *l.*, 92
Vajrākara, Skt., equivalent of 'Vayirākaram', 92
Vākāṭaka, *dy*, 18, 19, 21, 23, 34-37, 39-44, 48-49, 51-56, 58-59, 61, 63-64, 66, 68, 70-72, 76-77, 135-36, 141, 144, 146, 169, 171, 176, 211, 219, 225, 232
Vākāṭaka, *k.*, 21
Vākāṭaka dominions, 35
Vākāṭaka ins., 18, 58, 138, 141, 143, 181, 231
Vākāṭaka-mahādēvī, i.e., *Vā. pr.*, 172
Vakāṭaka-Vishṇukuṇḍi relationship, 36, 224
Vālin, *epic chara.*, 234
vallabha, ep., 108, 202
Vallabha, off., 131, 155, 238

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

Vishṇuvaridhana I, Kubja, *E· Chā. k.*, 8, 9, 16, 67, 90, 104 112, 114, 120-21, 123, 125, 128, 198
Vishṇuvardhana III, *E. Cha. k.*, 144
Vishṇuvriddha, *gōtra*, 19
vishṭi, forced labour, 137
Viśrutacharita, pt, of wk., 35, 42
Viśvojyōtis, sac., 214
Vizianagaram, *tn.*, 14, 18, 166
Vogel, 128
Vōṅkhārabhōga, *di.*, 100
vridh, skt., root, 42
vrishala, 'wicked man', 26
vṛittāyata (elliptical)te., of Vishṇu, 149
V. S· *era*, 71
Vyākhyāsudhā, com., 168
Vyāsa, *au.*, 167, 179, 191, 193 199, 215, 217-19
Vyāvarttaka-dharmā, 'distinguishing epithet' 4
Wairagaḍh, *l.*, 92
Wallesar, M., 17
Wāraṅgal, *tn.*, 48
Wardha Dt., 134
Watters, 128
West Godavari Dt., 80, 82, 111, 234
Western Ghats, 231
Williams, M., 128
Yadu, *Purāṇic k.*, 211
yajana, one of the six-fold duties, 161
Yajña Śrī Sātakarṇi, *Sāta. k.* 33
Yājñavalkyasmṛti, wk., 141
Yajurvēda, Kṛishṇā, 144
Yajurvēda, Śukla, 144
yama, 'self-control' 164
Yamunā, *royal insignia*, 243
yāna, Bud. t.t., three of, 143, 154, 156
Yaśōdhara, *au.*, 32
yathā.vidhi-viniryapita- ghaṭik--āvāpta-puṇya-sañchaya, ep, 169, 236
yaugikārtha, 206
Yavana, *tribe.*, 216-17
Yayati, *purāṇic k.*, 25, 211-12
year of the Āguptāyika era 53
Years of the Gaṅga era: 845th 39th, 67-68, 99-100, 189
64th, 82, 102, 108
79th, 89, 102, 108
80th, 102, 108
87th, 99, 102
88th, 102, 108
91th, 102, 108
97th 102, 108
128th, 99, 102, 108
Years of the Gaṅga era :
128-54th 102, 189
137th 102, 189
138th, 189
183th, 189
Years of the Gupta era :
191th, 228
269th, 227
280th, 227
282nd, 226-27
300th, 228
Years of the Kalachuri era :
812nd 68
Years of the Śaka era :
380th, 48
465th, 70
488th, 9, 13, 81-83, 95, 174, 226
491st, 9, 11
532nd, 120
535th, 85
552nd, 15
553rd, 114
653rd 114
684th, 144
1139th, 211
1159th, 239
Year of the V. S,
611th, 71, 227
Years regnal,
5th of Jayasiṃha, 86, 199
8th of Pulakesi II 114, 120, 195
8th of Simhavarman, 82-83
10th of Vikramendravarman II, 12, 13, 80, 83, 170-71
11th of do 9, 13, 81, 83, 95, 173, 175
14th of do. 11-13, 81, 177
years Regnal: 64
15th of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, 64
15th of Nandivarman Pallavamala, 125
18th of Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi, 127
21st of Pulakēśi II, 120
25th of Pṛithivīmūla II, 94-97, 183
27th of Indrabhaṭṭārakavar. man, 13, 65-66, 69, 167
32nd year of Pravarasēna II, 58
33rd of Mādhavavarman II, 13, 45, 49-50, 63
37th of Gōvindavarman I, 9, 13, 38, 39, 45, 154
37th of Mādhavavarman II, 13, 46, 57, 60, 160
46th of Pṛithivīmahārāja, 103 105, 191
47th of Madhavavarman III, 62, 64-65, 164
48th (or 40th) of Mādhavavarman IV, 13, 16, 85-86, 180-81, 244
49th of Pṛithivīmahārāja, 104-06, 193
Yelēśvaram, *Bud site.*, 142, 146
Yeotmal Dt., 71
Yerrabaliguda, *vi*, 39
yodha, off., 179
Yōga, Yōgadarśana, ph., 103, 145, 190
yōjanā, l. m., 161, 239-41
Yuan Chwang, *Chinese pilgrim*, 44, 119, 135, 142, 149
Yudhishṭhira, *epic k.*, 189, 198, 215-16, 218-20
yuvarāja; crown prince', 58, 114, 120-21

कृत्या शङ्करनारायणाख्यस्य
मम चानया ।
अलमेलुपतिः प्रीयात् श्रीनिवासो
जगत्पिता ॥

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Presevation Foundation, Chandigarh

OUR PUBLICATIONS

	Rs. P.
ANKLET STORY *—Ka. Naa. Subramanyam*	40.00
ART OF CENTRAL ASIA *—Chhaya Bhattacharya*	200.00
EASTERN SPIRITUALITY *—Ian Kesarcodi-Watson*	50.00
THE ECONOMIC LIFE OF A BENGAL DISTRICT *—J. C. Jack*	40.00
FOREIGN AID TO INDIA *—Brojendra Nath Banerjee*	80.00
INDIAN IVORIES *—V. P. Dwivedi*	180.00
INDIAN PAINTING 'A ROMANCE' *—Usha Prasad*	80.00
MAHABHARATA MYTH AND REALITY DIFFERING VIEWS *—S. P. Gupta and K. S. Ramachandran*	80.00
MARWAR MURALS *—R. A. Agarwal*	120.00
MOPLAS UPRISING *—Sukhbir Choudhary*	35.00
MURDER OF DEMOCRACY *—Sukhbir Choudhary*	35.00
READINGS IN KAUTILYA'S ARTHASASTRA *—B. P. Sinha*	50.00
THE RELIGIOUS PROBLEM IN INDIA *—Annie Besant*	15.00
VISHNUKUNDIS AND THEIR TIMES *—Dr. S. Sankaranarayanan*	100.00
THE WORKS OF SIR WILLIAM JONES *—In Thirteen Volumes* *Each Volume*	125.00